

JPRS-UPA-87-037

28 October 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-87-037

CONTENTS

28 OCTOBER 1987

HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Need to Rewrite Official CPSU History Explained [N. N. Maslov; <i>VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS</i> No 7, Jul 87]	1
Party Historian Advocates Further Rehabilitations [V. Melnichenko; <i>PRAVDA UKRAINY</i> , 31 Jul 87]	7
Journal Publishes Bulgakov's Letters to Stalin [M. Bulgakov; <i>OKTYABR</i> No 6, Jun 87]	9
MOSCOW NEWS Republishes Lenin Interview [MOSCOW NEWS, 4 Oct 87]	21

SOCIAL ISSUES

Restructuring of RSFSR Court System Discussed [IZVESTIYA, 14 Oct 87]	23
PRAVDA Exposes Abuses by Moscow Militiamen [G. Vokhmyanin; <i>PRAVDA</i> , 15 Oct 87]	23
Gorkom Chief Reprimanded for Obstructing Police [A. Petrishchev; <i>SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA</i> , 7 Oct 87]	25
Jurist Calls For Reform of Appeals Procedure in Criminal Cases [A. Move; <i>PRAVDA</i> 1 Aug 87]	25
TuSSR: Doctors Tried for Refusal to Treat Child [V. Tsymbal; <i>TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA</i> , 8 Apr 87]	27
UkSSR: Komsomol Antinarcotics Program Improvements Reviewed [RABOCHAYA GAZETA; 30 May 87]	29

REGIONAL ISSUES

Major Environmental Problems in Moldavia Described [I. Drucse; <i>LITERATURNAYA GAZETA</i> , 29 Jul 87]	31
Concerns Over New Railroad Construction in Georgia Addressed [ZARYA VOSTOKA, 29 May 87]	35

Need to Rewrite Official CPSU History Explained
18000790b Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS
in Russian No 7, Jul 87 pp 47-62

[Article by Professor N. N. Maslov, doctor of historical sciences: "What Should the New Textbook of CPSU History Be Like?"]

[Excerpts] Guided by the ideas of the January 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the recommendations of the all-Union meeting of the heads of social science departments, the editors present the article by N. N. Maslov published below as the beginning of a discussion of problems of preparing a new textbook of CPSU history. We call on party historians to take part in the discussion, considering not only the issues raised in this article, but the whole spectrum of party history scientific and methodological problems (among others the problems of periodization, the general and the particular, and the use of partywide and local historical experience) in light of the restructuring of the social sciences and strengthening their tie with practical work to perfect socialist society.

The tasks of restructuring—this revolutionary process begun at the initiative of the party and encompassing all spheres of the life and activity of the Soviet people, apply directly to the social sciences as well.(1)

One cannot help seeing the fact, unacceptable in principle, that the social sciences—which for many years did not have adequate opportunity to directly affect the country's political life, discuss real problems, and identify the contradictions of reality—lost a significant part of their authority. And this could not help but be reflected in the attitude of students toward the social sciences; while showing a lively and immediate interest in the real problems of life, they did not want to accept its dogmatic and unobjective reflection in lectures and textbooks. "A paradoxical picture developed," M. S. Gorbachev said in his talk at the all-Union meeting of heads of VUZ social science departments, "What is most interesting and attractive in contemporary scientific knowledge—man and society, the laws of their development, contradictions, the class struggle, construction of the new world, the human race's aspiration toward the ideal, spiritual quests and disillusionments, acquiring the truth, and the heroes of creative labor—in lectures and in textbooks too often turns into something boring, official, and formalistic."(2)

Under conditions of accelerated economic and social progress the indoctrination of young people, increasing their social activism, and intensifying the ideological indoctrination functions of higher education become immeasurably more important. We will have to significantly raise the ideological-theoretical and methodological level of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism as the immutable foundation for molding the scientific worldview of Soviet specialists. We must strive to see that as

students assimilate knowledge in the field of Marxist-Leninist theory they also develop the ability to analyze the phenomena of social development independently and make active use of the knowledge obtained in their professional work. This is exactly how the CPSU Central Committee put the question when defining the tasks of restructuring higher and secondary specialized education in the country.(3)

The CPSU Central Committee has worked out a broad, integrated system of steps to improve the teaching of the socialist sciences at VUZes, relying on the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the propositions and conclusions of the Political Report of the Central Committee to the congress, the new edition of the CPSU Program, and the aims of the Central Committee advanced at the all-Union meeting of the heads of social science departments (1986), in the resolution "On the Journal *Kommunist*," and in other party documents. Among these measures is assigning the country's leading scientific institutions to prepare new textbooks in the social sciences on the basis of developing unified syllabi for CPSU history, philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism.

The task of preparing new textbooks, especially for the course in CPSU history, is extremely complex. The new textbooks must be qualitatively, and to a large degree in principle, different from those that have been used by Soviet higher education for decades.

Broad discussion, in the spirit of democratism and glasnost, of the content of the future textbooks and ways of presenting the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism in them, explaining ways to build the new order, refine socialism, and accelerate the socioeconomic of society and restructuring; critical use of past experience in formulating textbooks in the social science disciplines; reliance on the latest advances of science and revision of established stereotypes from this standpoint; and, consideration of the progressive know-how of social science teachers and departments—that is what is necessary and will permit the authors to overcome boredom, officialness, and formalism in the new textbooks, and rise to the level of contemporary demands.

The existence of a system of different textbooks on party history was a distinctive feature of the period of the late 1920's and early 1930's. We should also stress here the presence of a competitive principle among the authors and author collectives who prepared these texts and the serious critical review in the literature of the merits and shortcomings of each newly published book. All this promoted constant refinement of texts in party history and gave readers an opportunity to select the best ones.

The situation changed fundamentally with the appearance of the anti-Leninist ideology of the personality cult. Stalin essentially made the history of the VKP(b) [All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik)] into one of the basic tools in establishing this ideology. As early as 1931,

in his article "Certain Issues of the History of Bolshevism," he cast a shadow on Ye. M. Yaroslavskiy, author of one of the party history textbooks that was popular at that time, accusing him and other Bolshevik historians of supposedly playing into the hands of Trotskyite falsifiers of history.⁽¹²⁾ From then on "reprimands" of party historians, attaching political "labels," and using unfounded reprisals against them became common phenomena for some time. At the same time their works, those textbooks through which young people had formerly studied Bolshevism, were withdrawn from circulation.

"Istoriya VKP(b). Kratkiy kurs" (History of the VKP(b). Short Course) [The full official name of the book from the title page was "Istoriya Vseoyuznoy Kommunisticheskoy partii (bolshevikov). Kratkiy kurs. Pod redaktsiyey komissii TsK VKP(b). Odobren TsK VKP(b). 1938 goda" [History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevikov). Short Course. Edited by the Commission of the Central of the VKP(b). Approved by the VKP(b), 1938.] was proclaimed the "encyclopedia of basic knowledge in the field of Marxism-Leninism," and the one guide to party history, presenting the "official interpretation, approved by the VKP(b) Central Committee, of the basic questions of VKP(b) history and Marxism-Leninism and not permitting any arbitrary interpretations."⁽¹³⁾ For 15 years after this the "Short Course" determined not just the development of science, but especially the teaching of party history, which gave rise to dogmatism and unthinking acceptance.

After the 20th CPSU Congress, under conditions of the struggle to overcome the consequences of the personality cult and the limitations on democracy and the dogmatism associated with it, a system of textbooks on party history again began to take shape. Following the first mass textbook, "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union] which came out in 1959 under the editorship of B. N. Ponomarev, there appeared numerous courses of lectures on CPSU history prepared by the departments of CPSU history at Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, and Belorussian universities, the Higher Party School of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Military-Political Academy imeni V. I. Lenin. "Kurs lektsii po istorii KPSS" [Course of Lectures in CPSU History] edited by Professor S. I. Murashov, a party history text for students at technical VUZes, was published in two editions, and "Ocherki istorii KPSS" [Essays on CPSU History], a text for the schools of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism in the party education system which went through five editions, came out, as did others. Textbooks on source studies, historiography, and methodology of CPSU history appeared for the first time. After the mid-1970's, however, new editions of most of these books were no longer published. The only works left in circulation were B. N. Ponomarev's text, which today arouses a critical attitude, and the lectures on CPSU history written by teachers in the department of

party history of the Higher Party School (then the Academy of Social Sciences) of the CPSU Central Committee.

The tendency to curtail publications of textbooks in CPSU history should be viewed as nothing less than a result of the growth of dogmatism in the social sciences and bureaucratization of the leadership of scientific activity and higher education.

The decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent party documents aimed at enhancing the role of the social sciences and strengthening their links with practice, the democratization of social relations, and the expansion of openness demand, it seems to us, that we return to a system of texts in our science. The universities, party schools, technical and extension VUZes, and party education cannot and should not structure their lessons according to a single textbook; they have different curricula, different tasks, different student bodies, and so on. Rigid approaches in teaching are always dangerous. They are especially dangerous in teaching the social sciences, including CPSU history. It would also seem wise to prepare and publish readers in party history like those published in the 1920's in order to give the students an opportunity to delve into the vagaries of the fight for Leninism themselves and become convinced of the truth and majesty of Lenin's ideas as the result of independent analysis of the documents.

A question of enormous importance in preparing the new textbook of CPSU history is its periodization of the history of the party's revolutionary transforming activity and, correspondingly, of its structure. This is one of the conceptual questions. The consistent disclosure of the logic of events, the sequence of strategic phases and tactical periods in CPSU history, and the primary patterns of party activity depend on a correct solution to this problem.

The principles of periodization of the history of the RSDRP [Russian Social Democratic Workers Party] and Bolshevism were, of course, worked out by Lenin. They were treated fairly recently in the journal *Voprosy Istorii KPSS*.⁽¹⁴⁾ Therefore, we will only recall that based on the objective conditions of party activity at different times and on the strategic and tactical missions it developed and performed, Lenin formulated two basic schemes of periodization of the history of the party: on the basis of identifying the major strategic periods and the more detailed tactical periods.⁽¹⁵⁾

But the Leninist principles of periodization were distorted. In a letter to the compilers of the textbook on party history in 1937 Stalin gave his own scheme of periodization of this history.⁽¹⁶⁾ If we refer to the pre-October period, the distortions concerned, first of all, the key question of the time when the new type of party emerged

in Russian—arbitrarily set at 1912 by Stalin, and, secondly, the chronological framework of the period of the new revolutionary upsurge, whose beginning Stalin also set as 1912 even though Lenin related it to the summer of 1910.(17)

As for the largest part of the post-October period (after Lenin's death), it was based on subjective criteria: an unscientific fetishization of particular directives and statements by Stalin. For example, Chapter 10 of the "Short Course," entitled "The Party of Bolsheviks in the Struggle for Socialist Industrialization of the Country," encompassed 1926-1929, in other words, the period when nothing but preparations were being made to undertake the industrialization which was fully carried out in subsequent years.(18) Such a periodization inevitably led to the study of party history "by congresses," each of which was viewed as the start of the next period.

It took a great deal of work to overcome the stereotypes of the Stalinist scheme. Even the draft program of the course in CPSU history which was submitted to the all-Union meeting of heads of social science departments in 1986 preserved many of its elements. It was, of course, impossible to accept this. And experience with teaching CPSU history at the VUZes long ago came into contradiction with such structuring of the course. As time passed and the volume of the course increased significantly (while the class hours allocated for it were preserved) and the 27th CPSU Congress had already been held, it became simply impossible to study party history "by congresses." The answer to this situation was seen (and correctly) in switching to problem-oriented lectures. But the ways to it were sought more in methodological innovations than in structural changes in the syllabus, which would be the only correct way. Changing the form but preserving the old content did not and could not produce the needed results. The syllabus of the VUZ course in CPSU history approved in 1987 is basically free of these shortcomings, although certain survivals still persist. This document provides an adequate foundation for writing the new textbook of CPSU history, which would rely on the Leninist periodization and follow it structurally.

In this sense it is exceptionally important to enlarge the topics of the book's sections, relying on identification of the main strategic periods in CPSU history. In this connection we propose to single out the following periods: 1. The emergence of the social democratic movement in Russian and the struggle of the Russian Marxists headed by V. I. Lenin to create a proletarian party of a new type (1883-1903); 2. The struggle of the Bolshevik party to carry out the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russian (1904-February 1917); 3. The struggle of the Bolsheviks for the victory of the socialist revolution (March-October 1917); 4. The party in the period of building socialism. Construction of the basic elements of a socialist society in the USSR (October 1917-1939)(20); 5. The activity of the party to strengthen the country's defense capacity. The Communist Party—inspiration

and organizer of the victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War against Hitler's Germany (1939-1945); 6. The party in the period of restoration of the national economy and continued development of socialism (1945-1956); 7. The Communist Party in conditions of developed socialism on its own basis. The search for ways to improve socialism (1956-1985) (We support the idea of N. A. Barsukov on identification of the period 1956-1985 (see *Voprosy Istorii KPSS*, 1987, No 6, p 101), but we do not share his suggestion on the name of this period, particularly because it is not clear what new historical conditions are being referred to); 8. The struggle of the CPSU to carry out the strategic course of the 27th CPSU Congress.(21)

Each of these sections, except the last which began in the spring of 1985, represents a relatively complete period in CPSU history. The textbook should thoroughly reveal the uniqueness of all these periods, including an analysis of the corresponding historical situation, the sequence of changes taking place in the objective situation, the essential features of class and political contradictions, and a description of the conditions of the party and its organizations. This will enable readers to clearly grasp the objective conditions in which the party operated and correctly understand how they conditioned party strategy and tactics. Special attention here should be given to the turning point in history which demanded a decisive change in previous strategic concepts, tactical goals and slogans, and a restructuring of party work.

Within each of these sections shorter phases can be singled out in which party activity could be viewed on the problem level.

On this basis it will be possible to disclose the reasons for the appearance of particular party documents which have to be analyzed not by themselves, but in their close connection with the historical situation. The materials of congresses and their resolutions on specific issues are organically included in the content of the problem lectures, which are devoted to definite aspects of party activity. Conditions will also appear for explaining the objective and subjective causes of disagreements in the party, revealing the positions of the opposing sides, and giving substantiated criticism of the views of opportunists.

An objective description of the results of the activity of the party and its organizations to carry out decisions that were made is fundamentally important. In our opinion, this is the determining condition in extracting the party's historical experience accumulated during practical work and identifying the patterns of the revolutionary struggle and socialist building it has directed. It is equally important to identify the lessons of history that were grasped and utilized in the past and are also useful for contemporary party activity. "If we do not wish to take up the position of pure utopianism and empty phrases," Lenin emphasized, "we must take account of the experience of past years."(22)

This concrete historical material should serve as the basis for theoretical conclusions and generalizations and for revealing the contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory made by Lenin, other party theoreticians, and the collective brain of the party—its congresses and conferences and plenums of the party Central Committee.

Thus, the new textbook on CPSU history should rely on the scientific periodization of our party's history; its structure should correspond to this history, while its content, necessarily preserving the concrete historical approach to the past, must be raised at least an order higher in the theoretical sense. Presentation and description of facts should give way to analysis and interpretation of historical experience, extracting the lessons of history, and to the theoretical generalizations that follow from them.

"Responsible analysis of the past clears the way to the future, while half-truths that timidly bypass the difficult points retard the development of realistic policies and hinder our forward movement," the Political Report of the Central Committee to the 27th party congress said.⁽²³⁾ This proposition, this lesson in truth, signifies a demand to put an end to subjectivism in treating the history of our country and party, to polishing and embellishing it, to cowardly caution in dealing with the real contradictions in reality, the hardships and problems inherent in it, and the problems, failures, and mistakes made in the course of building the new society.

In all periods of its history our party has been a party of pioneers. It has traveled an unknown path, clearing the road to socialism for the entire human race. This was an extremely complex matter, especially in view of the country's economic and cultural backwardness, the bitterness of the class struggle in the transitional period, and the existence of hostile capitalist encirclement.

Under the leadership of the Leninist Communist Party, overcoming all barriers, the Soviet people have built socialism and turned our country into a mighty socialist power. This was a great historical feat. The history of our country and our party is overall a constructive, triumphant history.

But it would be incorrect to depict it as a solid chain of successes and victories, as a direct ascent to the current high level of social development. The movement to it also entailed overcoming contradictions and went through difficulties and mistakes when it was necessary to go back, look for new ways, and redo what had already been done in order to reach the assigned goals. We have not had victories only. There were other things too. "A heavy price had to be paid for deviations from Leninist principles and methods of building the new society, for violations of socialist legality and the democratic norms of life in the party and in society, for voluntaristic mistakes, and for dogmatism in thinking and inertia in practical actions."⁽²⁴⁾ All this cannot be forgotten; the history of the party cannot be depicted as easy and

without conflicts. This can only diminish the party's merits and take away from the heroic enthusiasm in overcoming the objective and subjective difficulties of building the new world.

On the other hand, it is also intolerable to blacken our history, reduce it to errors and mistakes, to subjectivist and voluntaristic actions. Blackening is also a deviation from historical objectivity, from Marxist-Leninist party mindedness.

Disclosing the truth, the whole truth about the victories and failures, the achievements and errors of the party—that is the way, it seems to us, that should be taken by the authors of the new textbook of CPSU history. Only in this way can we restore young people's trust in party history science, increase interest in studying it, and indoctrinate them in a spirit of respect for the heroic and thorny path traveled by the CPSU.

The periodic rewriting of history had a negative impact on the state of affairs in party history science.⁽²⁵⁾ It inevitably led to distortion of historical truth, to subjective distortion of the past.

The roots of this phenomenon go back to the 1930's. The emergence and establishment of the personality cult of I. V. Stalin was often accompanied by direct distortion of the past for the purposing of enlarging his role in history and "proving" his infallibility and brilliance. To do this the role of Lenin in formation of the party and its activity, in carrying out the Great October Socialist Revolution, and in building the socialist state was diminished. To do this the political adventurer Beriya formulated the false "theories" of dual centers in the formation of the new type of party (the equal significance of Lenin's *Iskra* and the newspaper *Pravda* in preparing for formation of the party) and of two leaders of the party and revolution. These theses were further elaborated in the "Short Course," which attributed decisive feats to Stalin in working out and implementing the party theory and program on the nationality issue and formation of the USSR, in destroying the interventionists and White Guards in the civil war years, in working out the program of building socialism, and building it in the USSR.

It is natural that after the 20th CPSU Congress, which set the challenge of overcoming the consequences of the personality cult, it was objectively necessary to correct the subjectivist distortions of party history permitted in the "Short Course." In the late 1950's and early 1960's the journals *Kommunist*, *Voprosy Istorii KPSS*, and other sociopolitical and scientific publications worked to restore the historical truth and disclose the anti-Marxist essence of the ideology of the personality cult.

The textbook edited by B. N. Ponomarev made a significant contribution to developing the Leninist idea of CPSU history. This work restored the role of Lenin as the founder and leader of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet State and showed the enormous importance of his

works and guiding ideas for the party's revolutionary transforming activity. At the same time in later editions, especially those of the late 1970's and early 1980's, the author collective (which in 1983 included the author of this article) did not withstand the general trend of that day toward uncritical treatment of reality, justifying party documents adopted and slogans proclaimed, and exaggerating the contributions of certain party leaders. This could not help affecting the authority of the textbook. Today, after the 27th CPSU Congress, it cannot, of course, serve as a text for the study of party history.

It was precisely this fact that made it necessary to prepare a new textbook of CPSU history with due regard for those lessons which were formulated by the 27th party congress and the January and June 1987 Plenums of the Central Committee.

Needless to say, this does not mean a complete revision of all party history. Everything that is genuine knowledge should be fully preserved. At the same time the advances of scientific thought in recent decades should also be reflected and we must renounce stereotypes and simplified schemes in treating, for example, the socioeconomic preconditions for the socialist revolution in Russia, the process of formation and the composition of the army of the October revolution, the contradictions in the history of "breaking up" the old state apparatus and creating the Soviet State, and other important historical issues. It is necessary to disclose Lenin's struggle against bureaucracy and to show the role of party and state control organs and the broad masses of working people in this important cause.

When reviewing the party's activity in building socialism, the textbook should point out both the achievements and successes and the difficulties and costs that are inevitable, as already stated, in this new and majestic accomplishment.

The negative effect of Stalin's personality cult must be shown more broadly, not only in relation to the 1930's, but also the 1940's and early 1950's, especially in the spheres of politics and ideology; its consequences in the form of dogmatic thinking, fear of responsibility, and inability to use democratic institutions and openness are sometimes manifested even today. Not only the subjective, but also the objective reasons for the appearance of the personality cult as a social phenomenon should be revealed.

Finally, the history of party activity in the 1960's-1980's must be written anew. This challenge is extraordinarily difficult, but possible on the basis of the principled instructions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the January and June 1987 Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee.

Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, observed, "When showing our historical

path we must remember the lessons of the past. Not repeat its mistakes. Not stage celebrations. Not tailor the history to some idea. Not smooth it out, give it a conventional shine. It, the history of our revolution, does not need this. It is so heroic and edifying that it needs no cosmetic touch at all. Only the truth, only an honest look at the path traveled can and should inspire new energy and enthusiasm to see that our Homeland moves forward along the rungs of progress, to communism." (26)

There is nothing to add to these correct statements. The authors of the new textbook of CPSU history should be guided by them in their work.

One other major shortcoming of the literature on CPSU history was correctly pointed out at the all-Union meeting of heads of VUZ social science departments: depersonalization of the history of the heroic path of millions of communist-Leninists, frequently turning it into a dry schematic story. (27)

And after all, treating history in this way is incorrect in terms of both theory and fact. Theoretically because the subjective factor plays a determining role in history with the given level of development of the economic base of society. "History," K. Marx and F. Engels wrote in "The Holy Family," "does not do anything. It 'does not possess any vast wealth,' it 'does not fight any battles'! It is not 'history,' but human beings, real living human beings—they are the ones who do everything, possess everything, and fight for everything. 'History' is not some kind of special personality which people use to attain their own goals. History is nothing else but the activity of people pursuing their own goals." (28) It should be stressed here that under conditions of socialism the role of the subjective factor—the laboring masses, parties, and individuals—increases immeasurably compared to presocialist formations. For the first time in history society is acquiring the possibility of consciously directing its own development, guided by knowledge and understanding of the action of the objective laws of economics and social life. And the deeper this knowledge and understanding is, the more adequate it is to the objective conditions of the given stage of society's development, and the more fully the activity of people fits the real needs and opportunities of reality, then the more effective its results will be.

This is exactly why scientifically substantiated management of social development is so crucially important under socialism and why any manifestations of subjectivism and voluntarism are so intolerable. This was all very forcefully emphasized in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and in the materials of the January and June 1987 Plenums of the Central Committee.

By saying nothing about the people who are making history, we distort history. Nonetheless, a paradoxical situation has developed in party history works and textbooks: history is present but, with rare exceptions,

the people who acted in it are not. Usually historical figures are only set in a general background, as a rule by "listing," and some are not mentioned at all.

But yet great indoctrinational meaning for young people who are looking "for someone to model their life on" can be contained in just a short description of the life or even particular episodes of revolutionary activity and service to the people by numerous rank-and-file and prominent party figures! Lenin understood this well when, in his obituary article "Ivan Vasilyevich Babushkin," he proposed the idea of writing a pamphlet with biographies of workers who died heroically in the struggle against the autocracy. "Such a pamphlet," he observed, "would be the best reading for young workers; from it they will learn how a conscious worker must live and work." (29)

It would be exceptionally useful for the textbook to find room for short biographies of I. V. Babushkin and V. A. Shelgunov, N. G. Poletayev and G. I. Petrovskiy, Bolshevik workers who were heroes in October and the civil war, the first shock workers, the pioneers of socialist competition, the initiators of the Stakhanovite movement, the heroes of the Great Patriotic War, production innovators in the period of economic restoration after the war, leaders of restructuring, and our contemporaries, representatives of all the nations and ethnic groups of the harmonious family of Soviet peoples. The lives of such communist heroes, patriots, and internationalists are heroic feats in the name of revolution and socialism, in the name of the future.

It is intolerable for young people not to know the main party figures who directed the building of socialism. Unfortunately, the names of F. E. Dzerzhinskiy, S. M. Kirov, V. V. Kuybyshev, M. I. Kalinin, A. V. Lunacharskiy, Ya. M. Sverdlov, and other prominent party figures remain just names to most of our young people.

Many party figures are mentioned in textbooks only in a negative way, in the ranks of those who formerly belonged to oppositionist groups. But after all, some of them were active underground fighters and took part in the Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism. For some of them membership in the opposition was only a phase that they themselves later regretted. Most of them were fully rehabilitated after the 20th party congress, and articles about them appear in the press on anniversary dates. But in history textbooks they often remain "antiheroes," which is unjust on both the political and human levels.

For party history it is also important to correct this shortcoming in the sense of an objective treatment of the epoch of the Great October Socialist Revolution and a correct presentation of Lenin's role as its leader and head of the Soviet State. We distort history by characterizing many major figures of our party from the start as "enemies of the people" (this idea still has not been completely eliminated from the consciousness of party historians) and as a kind of "congenital" opportunists.

Lenin at the head of the October Revolution and surrounded by schismatics and opportunists—that is certainly an attractive picture for our ideological enemies!

But after all, in reality most of the people who accomplished the revolution along with Lenin were genuine fighters for the interests of the laboring people. Yes, they sometimes made mistakes, and Lenin corrected them. Yes, among the Bolsheviks there were arguments about alternative paths and ways of carrying out the socialist revolution and the building of socialism which reflected both the level of understanding of the next party challenges and various class influences on party members and certain party leaders. But these arguments were ultimately resolved in favor of revolution and socialism. Erroneous ideas and proposals were thrown out and the party, with former oppositionists taking part in its activities, went along its triumphant way.

It would seem that the principles formulated on this score in the well-known CPSU Central Committee decree on preparation and publication of a multivolume party history have not lost their significance today either.

All the above, it seems to us, should find a worthy place in the new textbook of CPSU history. It will "humanize" our history, instill it with a spirit of truthfulness, and greatly enhance the interest in and respect for it felt by college students and all who study party history.

Footnotes

1. See "Materialy Plenuma Tsentralnogo Komiteta KPSS, 27-28 yanvarya 1987 goda" [Materials of the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, 27-28 January 1987], Moscow, 1987, pp 8-9.
2. "XXVII syezd KPSS i zadachi kafedr obshchestvennykh nauk. Materialy Vsesoyuznogo soveshchaniya zaveduyushchikh kafedrami obshchestvennykh nauk vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeniy. Moskva, 1-3 oktyabrya 1986 g." [The 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Social Science Departments. Materials of the All-Union Meeting of Heads of VUZ Social Science Departments. Moscow, 1-3 October 1986], Moscow, 1987, pp 9-10.
3. See PRAVDA 21 March 1987.
12. See Stalin, I. V., "Sochineniya" [Works], Vol 13, Moscow, 1952, pp 101-102.
13. "KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsiy i plenumov TsK [The CPSU in the Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Plenums of the Central Committee], Part 1, 7th ed. Moscow, 1954, p 316. (In later editions of this work this document was not published).
14. See, for example, VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, 1987, No 1, pp 99-103.

15. See Lenin, V. I., "Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Works], Vol 6, pp 180-183; Vol 41, pp 8-13; Vol 43, pp 331-332.

16. See "Ob izuchenii istorii SSSR" [On Studying the History of the USSR], Moscow, 1938.

17. See Lenin, op. cit., Vol 20, p 74.

18. See "Istoriya Vsesoyuznoy Kommunisticheskoy partii (bol'shevikov). Kratkiy kurs" [History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik)], Moscow, 1946, pp 267-286.

19. See "Programmy po obshchestvennym naukam. Istoriya KPSS. Filosofiya. Politicheskaya ekonomiya. Nauchnyy kommunizm. Dlya vysshikh uchebnykh zavedeniy" [Social Science Syllabi. CPSU History. Philosophy. Political Economy. Scientific Communism. For Higher Educational Institutions], Moscow, 1987, pp 7-57.

20. We consider it useful to carry this period to the 18th Congress of the VKP(b), which proclaimed that the USSR had entered the "zone of completion of building a classless socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism" ("KPSS v rezolyutsiyakh...." op. cit., Vol 7, 9th supplemented and revised edition, Moscow, 1985, p 54).

21. The beginning of the period is dated to the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

22. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 40, p 253.

23. "Materialy XXVII syezda Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuz" [Materials of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Moscow, 1986, p 23.

24. "To the Soviet People. Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union," PRAVDA, 14 March 1987.

25. See *Kommunist*, No 15, p 14.

26. PRAVDA 24 March 1987.

27. See "XXVII syezd KPSS i zadachi...." op. cit., p 22.

28. Marx, K. and Engels, F., "Soch." [Works], Vol 2, p 102.

29. Lenin, op. cit., Vol 20, p 83.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Voprosy istorii KPSS", 1987

11176

Party Historian Advocates Further Rehabilitations
18000790a Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 31 Jul 87p 2

[Article by V. Melnichenko, deputy director of the Ukrainian CP Central Committee Institute of Party History, branch of the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, candidate of historical sciences: "The Truth of History"]

[Text] One of the characteristic features of the restructuring [perestroika] of Soviet society as a whole and of the social sciences in particular is a truly universal interest in the history of our Fatherland, a hunger to overcome the lack of truth in historical works. This has also manifested itself clearly in the considerable social response to the interview with Professor Yu. Afanasyev, published in *Sovetskaya Kultura* on 21 March 1987 under the title "From the Standpoint of Truth and Realism." The polemic started by him, in which diametrically opposed viewpoints are clashing, has not died down. This is a normal, healthy process that testifies to the profound democratization of Soviet society and scientific life and to the firm foothold achieved by real openness [glasnost].

But we would offend our own conscience if we asserted that there are no alarming aspects in this polemic. Let us note that, whether he wants to or not, Yu. Afanasyev takes the position of completely denying the validity of Soviet historical science. Such a position can hardly be considered to be realistic and to reflect the truth without qualification.

Analysis of the polemical responses indicates that people of various occupations and ages actively support Yu. Afanasyev's critical mood. They are unanimous in condemning the dogmatism and scholasticism, subjectivism, and depersonalization which reigned in historical science for many years. This cannot help but please us. But we also cannot help listening to those who caution us against flat-out, thoughtless rejection of everything and everybody. Would not such rejection eliminate those positive features that did exist in our historical science, and our entire historical path?

M. S. Gorbachev put it very well: "I think that we must treasure every day lived since the October revolution. Even the most difficult days were not lived in vain. It is all our history. How could we permit disrespect for those generations who laid the foundation of socialism, who gave us the opportunity to move forward today? Of course there were mistakes, even tragedies. But if we look at what we achieved thanks to the efforts of the party and the people, the results are stunning. Without historical roots there is no people. A tree without roots will wither and die."

Or take, for example, the view that there was a "dismantling of Lenin's 'cost accounting socialism' policy," and it began, according to N. Shmelev, in 1927-1928. He

goes on to say that by carrying out the slogan of eliminating the kulaks as a class "they were in essence abolishing the class of the peasantry" (*Novyy Mir*, No 6, 1987). It is evident that it would be a mistake to call for a taboo on these and other extreme judgments and statements. They reflect real, painful problems. But we must clearly understand that even the most unexpected, seemingly most novel ideas and conclusions require scientific argumentation, evidence, and facts, and for the present they are plainly lacking.

Perhaps the publicistic dialogue ("Political Testament," *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, 22 July 1987) published by F. Burlatskiy seems more impressive today than the statements of scientists. But it creates an impression more than it convinces. Why? Because it does not have a genuinely thorough scientific analysis of the very complex problem of choosing the path of further socialist development in the late 1920's. In our view, only a simplified outline of the problem has been worked out so far. And that is not to mention that N. I. Bukharin's position (whose views the mass reader can only learn now from secondary sources) remain, unclarified.

It is obviously time for certain methodologically important and sharply debated subjects of newspaper polemics to be brought more actively into scientific debate, transferred to the pages of our scientific journals, and documented much more thoroughly.

Today, on the eve of the 70th anniversary of Great October, the pressing need for civic rehabilitation of many party figures who were wrongly called enemies of Leninism and socialism is felt with special force. N. Maslov is right when he writes that we must talk about the mistakes and blunders of party figures, but not forget their contributions either (*Moskovskiy Novostil*, 19 July 1987).

Restoring the good name of Leninist revolutionaries is becoming the norm today. There is no doubt that we will hear about many undeservedly forgotten warriors of the Leninist party by the anniversary of the October revolution. But we also must not pass over in silence those who, in some phase or other, in fact did oppose V. I. Lenin on particular issues of party policy, but were major party and state figures. This is a very complex question, but we cannot retreat from resolving it.

Can our historical science really benefit from the fact that for many years the assessment of N. I. Bukharin, for example, went no further than "leader and ataman of the rightist capitulationists" in "Kratkiy kurs istorii VKP(B)" [Short Course of History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik)]? Of course it is easier to limit oneself to a political label than to disclose Lenin's thorough and accurate characterization with facts in hand: "Bukharin is not only an extremely important and valuable party theoretician. He is also legitimately considered a favorite of the whole party. But there is great doubt that his theoretical views can be

classified as completely Marxist, because there is something scholastic in him (he never studied and, I think, never fully understood the dialectic)."

This was dictated in December 1922, in other words after Bukharin headed the "left communists" in 1918, opposed V. I. Lenin at the 8th Congress of the RKP(B) [Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik)] in 1919, and after the 1920-1921 party debate about trade unions in which he first assumed a "bulfer" position and then joined the Trotsky group. While ruthlessly exposing Bukharin's incorrect views and antiparty actions (how many such unpleasant, extremely harsh and biting assessments there are in Lenin's articles and statements), in his brief description of Bukharin written as his life waned V. I. Lenin joined together what seemed unjoinable. This was the truth, and Vladimir Ilich did not fear it. But after the death of V. I. Lenin the wisdom of the truth was not always triumphant, and one-sided labeling took its place. I am convinced that the Leninist approach should be the model for historians today too.

I want to be understood correctly: it is not a matter of whitewashing Bukharin, or Pyatakov or Rakovskiy (incidentally, at the 1st Congress of the KP(B)U [Ukrainian Communist Party (Bolshevik)] Pyatakov was elected the first secretary of the Central Committee of the KP(B)U in the history of the Ukrainian Communist Party, and Rakovskiy headed the Peoples Commissariat for the Ukraine from January 1919 until the summer of 1923). It is a question of not painting their portraits in uniformly dismal colors. Let our young contemporaries have a chance to see them through the eyes of V. I. Lenin.

In his play "The Peace of Brest" Mikhail Shatrov was able in some degree to avoid one-sidedness and arbitrariness in evaluating his enemies. At the same time he did not touch up their position, which was lethal for the revolution; rather he exposed it completely. But still those working along with Lenin are living people, not wooden, blinded figures. On this occasion the playwright was ahead of the scientists.

In the meeting with leaders of the mass information media and creative unions held in July of this year at the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev pointed out Lenin's idea that you must be able to analyze the position of your enemy, even your class enemy, because no one will pose issues so profoundly and acutely, no one will so persistently seek weaknesses in your position, as your enemy.

We must admit that at the present time our writers are often ahead of the historian in boldly posing critical, little-studied problems. In recent times, as we know, works by A. Tvardovskiy, A. Bek, and others which were written many years ago and are not without interest to scientists have been published. Unfortunately, so far there has been no mention of any of our researchers offering truly interesting material with an honest view of our history that was unpublished in its day. Moreover,

we are desperately lacking in fresh, serious scientific articles. Even though there are many who are talking about new approaches in historical science.

All this has manifested itself in evaluation of the personality and activities of I. V. Stalin as well, paradoxical as it may seem, historians are lagging behind. I think that literary critics exaggerate the force and depth of the artistic and investigative reflection and interpretation of those difficult years in A. Rybakov's novel "Deti Arhata" [Children of the Arbat]. But they are right about one thing: literature has identified its "neighbors," like an infantry unit that courageously surmounts the obstacles it faces without waiting for the arrival of the "main forces" (see *Literaturnaya Gazeta* 8 July 1987).

Since we have already mentioned our literary people, I cannot help saying this. They have done a great deal recently for publication of works that are little known to our readers, in particular the works of those authors who did not accept Soviet power. Perhaps the most vile in this respect is Vladimir Nabokov. But how was he presented to Soviet readers, including young people? Issue No 6 of *Yunist* for this year published Nabokov's essay on Pushkin. From the afterword to the publication young men and women, who possibly are meeting V. Nabokov for the first time, can learn that he was fluent in several languages, was a serious student of chess and sports, and did a great deal of work on artistic translation of the Russian classics into English. And only in passing is it quickly mentioned that "he did not recognize and accept socialist Russia."

In S. Zalygin's afterword to V. Nabokov's very interesting study "Nikolay Gogol" (published in *Novyi Mirov* No 4, 1987), we read that the author was an outstanding poet and prose writer with an elegant aristocratic writing style; that he stood out in the Russian literature of his time; and that he also was an entomologist, morphologist, and taxonomist. There is not a single word about the fact that Vladimir Nabokov was a Russian emigre who openly opposed our Soviet Homeland and wished for its defeat in the Patriotic War against fascist Germany.

Aren't we jumping from one extreme to the other? First we did not publish an author for many years because of his difficult biography. Now every thick journal considers it an honor to publish him, but at the same time they shamefully cover up the unpleasant biographical facts. You must agree, though, that in this case there is serious damage to the democratism and openness which in fact made the publication of such generally necessary things possible. But these publications obviously must be accompanied, at a minimum, with scientific commentary and objective literary critical articles.

It is very important today, when a reinterpretation of our historical experience that is unprecedented since the time of Lenin is underway, to ensure that a scientific, balanced, genuinely Leninist approach without any opportunism is taken to this enormous, complex, but necessary work.

11176

Journal Publishes Bulgakov's Letters to Stalin

Izvestiya 765a Moscow OATY IRR in Russian No 6
Jun 87 pp 175, 191

[Letters from Bulgakov published with a commentary by V. Losev, candidate of historical sciences, under the rubric "From Our Literary Heritage": "Letters"]

[Text] TO THE SECRETARY OF THE USSR CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (TSIK) AVEL SOFRONOVICH YENIKIDZE

In view of the fact that my works are obviously absolutely unacceptable for the Soviet public,

in view of the fact that total suppression of my works in the USSR is driving me to ruin,

in view of the fact that my destruction as a writer has already resulted in financial catastrophe (my lack of savings, my inability to pay taxes, and my inability to live, starting with next month, can be documented)

In a state of immeasurable weariness,

with all my efforts in vain,

I turn to the country's supreme organ — the Central Executive Committee of the USSR and ask

permission for myself, together with my wife Lyubov Yevgeniyevna Bulgakova, to go abroad for whatever period of time the USSR government may designate for me

— [Signed] Mikhail Atanasyevich Bulgakov (author of the plays "Turbine Days", "The Runn'ng", and others), Moscow, 3 November 1929

To A. M. GORKIY

3 November 1929

Dear Aleksey Maksimovich!

I have submitted a request to the USSR government for permission to leave the USSR, with my wife, for a period of time to be specified for me

I ask you, Aleksey Maksimovich, to support my application. I wanted, in a detailed letter, to tell you everything that is happening to me, but my weariness and my hopelessness are immeasurable. I cannot write a thing

Why hold a writer in a country where his works cannot exist? I ask for a humane solution — let me go

— [Signed] Respectfully yours, M. Bulgakov

TO THE USSR GOVERNMENT — From Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov

I turn to the Government of the USSR with the following letter:

1.

After my works were prohibited, voices began to be heard among many citizens whom I am known as a writer, giving me one and the same piece of advice:

That I compose a "communist play" (I cite in quotation marks) for and, additionally, that I appeal to the USSR government with a penitential letter, which would contain a rejection of the views which I have earlier expressed in my literary works as well as assurances that, from this day on, I will work as a writer and fellow-traveller devoted to the idea of communism.

The purpose: to save myself from persecution, poverty, and unavoidable ruin in my field.

I have not followed this advice. I could hardly succeed in portraying myself to the USSR government in a favorable light by writing a deceitful letter which represents a slovenly and, at the same time, naive political curvet.

I have not even made an attempt to compose a communist play, knowing in advance that such a play would not come out of me.

A desire, grown ripe within me, to put an end to my suffering as a writer, forces me to turn to the government of the USSR with a truthful letter.

2.

Analyzing my scrapbooks of clippings, I have found a total of 301 references to myself in the Soviet press during the 10 years of my literary activities. Three of these were laudatory and 298 of them were hostile and insulting.

The latter 298 present a mirror reflection of my life as a writer.

They called the hero of my play "Turbine Days" Aleksey Turbin, a "SON OF A BITCH", and they introduced the author of the play as "one who is suffering from A DOG'S OLD AGE". They wrote about me as a "Literary JANITOR", mopping up what is left after "A DOZEN GUESTS HAVE VOMITED".

They wrote as follows:

"...MISHKA Bulgakov, the godfather of my c. d. ALSO, EXCUSE ME FOR THE EXPRESSION. A WRITER, IS ROOTING AROUND IN LONG-ROT-TING GARBAGE. What is this, I ask, little brother, you have an DIRTY SNOOT... I am a delicate person,

GO AND GET CLEANED UP... The man in the street needs Turbines like a DOG NEEDS A BRASSIERE... He turned up, the SON OF A BITCH. TURBINE SHOWED UP, MAY HE HAVE NEITHER CROWDS NOR SUCCESS..." (*Zhizn Iskusstva*, No 44 1927)

They wrote "about Bulgakov, who has been and will remain a NEO-BOURGEOIS MONSTROSITY, spitting with poisoned but powerless saliva on the working class and its communist ideals." (*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, 14 Oct 1926)

The reported that I like the "ATMOSPHERE OF A DOG'S WEDDING that surrounds some red-haired wife of a friend". (A. Lunacharskiy, *Izvestiya*, 8 Oct 1926), and that a "STENCH" comes from my play "Turbine Days" (Stenographic record of a May 1927 Agitprop meeting), and so on, and so on.

I hasten to say that I certainly am not including these quotes here in order to complain about criticism or to enter into any kind of polemics. My aim is much more serious.

I am showing from documents I have in hand that, during all the years of my literary work, the entire Soviet press and, along with it, also all the institutions to which repertoire control has been assigned, have unanimously and with EXCEPTIONAL FURY demonstrated that the works of Mikhail Bulgakov cannot exist within the USSR.

And I declare that the USSR press has been absolutely right.

3.

My pamphlet "The Blood-Red Island" ("Bagrovyy Ostrov") (1) will serve as a starting point for me in this letter.

Every critic in the USSR, without exception, greeted this play with the statement that it is "talentless, toothless, and squalid" and that it represents "a slander of the revolution".

The unanimity was total, but it was broken suddenly and completely unexpectedly.

In No. 12 of the "Repertoire Bulletin" for 1928, there appeared a review by P. Novitskiy, in which it was reported that "The Blood-Red Island" is an interesting and sharp-witted parody," in which "there arises the sinister shadows of a Grand Inquisitor, suppressing artistic creativity, cultivating SLAVISH, ABSURDLY-FAWNING DRAMATIC CLICHES, effacing the personality of the actor and the writer," that "The Blood-Red Island" discusses a "sinister dark force which is training HELOTS, TOADIES, AND PANEGY-RISTS".

One may ask: — where is the truth?

In the final analysis, what is "The Blood-Red Island"? A "squalid, talentless play" or is it a "sharp-witted pamphlet"?

The truth lies in the review by Novitskiy. I do not presume to judge how sharp-witted my play is, but I confess that a sinister shadow does indeed arise in the play and this is the shadow of the Glavrepertkom (Chief Repertoire Committee). This is what is training the helots, panegyrists and frightened "servants". This is what is killing creative thought. It is in the process of ruining the Soviet theater and will ruin it.

I have not expressed these thoughts in a whispered voice while hiding in a corner. I have put them in a dramatic pamphlet and put this pamphlet on the stage. The Soviet press, following the lead of Glavrepertkom, wrote that "The Blood-Red Island" is a slander of the revolution. This is silly prattle. There is no slander of the revolution in the play for many reasons, of which, for lack of room, I will mention one: as a consequence of its exceptional grandiosity, it is IMPOSSIBLE to write slander of the revolution. The pamphlet is not slander, and Glavrepertkom — is not the revolution.

But when the German press writes that "The Blood-Red Island" is "the first call in the USSR for freedom of the press" (*Molodaya Gvardiya*, No. 1 1929), it is writing the truth. I admit to this. The struggle with censorship, no matter of what kind and under whatever authority it exists, is my duty as a writer, as also are calls for freedom of the press. I am a passionate advocate of this freedom and I propose that any writer who tries to show that it this freedom is not necessary to him is like a fish who publicly asserts that it does not need the water.

4.

This is one of the characteristics of my creative work, and it alone is entirely sufficient to ensure that my works do exist within the USSR. But connected with this first characteristic are all the others which emerge in my satirical tales: the dark and mystical colors (I am A MYSTICAL WRITER) in which the countless deformities of our everyday life are portrayed, the venom which permeates my language, my deep skepticism concerning the revolutionary process which is taking place in my backward country and, counterpoised to it, the much-loved Grand Evolution, and, most importantly, my portrayal of the passionate traits of my people, of those same traits which, long before the revolution, caused such very great suffering to my teacher, M. Ye. Saltykov-Shchedrin.

It goes without saying that it did not even seriously occur to the Soviet press to take note of all this, while engaging in little-convincing reports that M. Bulgakov's satire contains "LIBEL".

One other time, when I first was becoming well-known, was it noted with a touch of arrogant surprise that:

"M. Bulgakov WANTS to become the satirist of our epoch" ("Knigonosha", No 6 1925).

Alas, the verb "to want" is used in vain in the present tense. It should be translated into the plu-perfect: M. Bulgakov BECAME A SATIRIST and precisely at a time when any kind of real (touching on forbidden areas) satire in the USSR is absolutely unthinkable.

The honor does not fall to me to express this criminal idea in the press. It was expressed with total clarity in an article by V. Blyum (*Literaturnaya Gazeta*, No 6), and the sense of this article was brilliantly and precisely encapsulated in a single statement:

ANY SATIRIST IN THE USSR LIBELS THE SOVIET SYSTEM.

Am I thinkable in the USSR?

5.

And finally, my final characteristic reflected in the suppressed plays "Turbine Days" and "The Running" and also in the novel "White Guards", is the persistent portrayal of the Russian intelligentsia as the best strata of society in our country. In particular, the portrayal of a noble family of the intelligentsia which, by the will of insurmountable historical fate, was thrown into the camp of the White Guards during the years of the civil war, in the traditions of "War and Peace". Such a portrayal is entirely natural for a writer who is vitally tied to the intelligentsia.

But the result of this kind of portrayal is that, in the USSR, its author, just like his heroes and despite the great efforts of both to stand DISPASSIONATELY ABOVE THE REDS AND THE WHITES, is stamped a white-guardist enemy and, having received this stamp, as anyone will understand, can figure himself a finished person in the USSR.

6.

My literary portrait is finished, and it is a political portrait. I cannot say how deep a crime can be found in it, but I ask for one thing — do not look for anything outside its limits. It has been honestly drawn.

7.

Now I am destroyed.

This destruction has been greeted with complete joy by the Soviet public and has been called "AN ACHIEVEMENT".

R. Pikel, noting my destruction (*Izvestiya*, 15 Oct 1929), expressed a liberal thought:

"We do not want to say by this that the name of Bulgakov has been crossed off the list of Soviet dramatists."

And he gave hope to the undone writer with the words that "we are talking about his past dramatic works."

However life, in the person of the Glavrepertkom, has shown that the liberalism of R. Pikel had no basis.

On 18 March 1930, I received a paper from the Glavrepertkom, which laconically advised that not a past one, but rather my new play "Servitude of the Hypocrites" ("Moliere") ("Kabala Svyatosh" ("Molyer")) WAS NOT AUTHORIZED FOR PRESENTATION.

I will say it briefly: My work in the book archives, my imagination, and a play which had received innumerable reviews from qualified theatrical specialists as being brilliant, were buried beneath two short lines written on government stationery.

R. Pikel was mistaken. Not only my past productions had perished, but also my present ones and all of my future ones. And I personally, with my own hands, threw the draft of a novel about the devil, the draft of a comedy, and the beginning of a second novel "The Theater" ("Teatr") into the stove.

All my things were without hope.

8.

I ask the Soviet government to take into consideration that I am not involved in politics, but am a literary person, and that I have given everything that I have produced to the Soviet stage.

I ask that you give your attention to the following two reviews about me in the Soviet press.

Both of them originate with implacable enemies of my productions, and therefore they are very valuable.

In 1925 it was written:

"A writer is making his appearance who DOES NOT EVEN CLOTHE HIMSELF IN THE COLORS OF A FELLOW-TRAVELLER." (L. Averbakh, *Izvestiya*, 20 Sept 1925)

And in 1929:

"His talent is just as obvious as is the socially reactionary nature of his creativity." (R. Pikel, *Izvestiya*, 15 Sept 1929)

I ask you to take into consideration that not being able to write is, for me, the same thing as being buried alive.

9.

I ASK THE GOVERNMENT OF THE USSR TO DIRECT ME TO LEAVE THE TERRITORY OF THE USSR IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY MY WIFE LUBOV YEVGENIYEVNA BULGAKOVA.

10.

I appeal to the humanity of the soviet authorities and ask them to let me go free, a writer who cannot be of use at home in his fatherland.

11.

If that which I have written is not convincing and if I am doomed to lifelong silence in the USSR, then I ask the Soviet government to give me work in my specialty and to assign me to a theater to work in the capacity of a staff director.

I specifically and precisely and emphatically ask for a categorical order concerning this assignment, because all my attempts to find work in this one area where I can be useful to the USSR, as an exceptionally qualified specialist, have been a complete fiasco. My name has been made so odious that my applications for work have been met with FRIGHT, despite the fact that my virtuoso knowledge of the stage is excellently known to an enormous number of actors and directors and, along with them, also by theater directors.

Without a trace of hostility, I offer the USSR a completely honest director specialist and actor, who will honestly undertake to stage any play, starting with Shakespeare's plays right up to and including the plays of our modern day.

I ask to be assigned as a directing assistant (direktor laborant) to the First Arts Theater, to the best school, which is headed by the masters K.S. Stanislavskiy and V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko.

If I am not assigned as a director, I ask for a staff position as an extra. If I also cannot be an extra, I ask for the position of a stage hand.

If this also is impossible, I ask the Soviet government to do with me what it must, but to do something, because, AT THIS MOMENT, I, a dramatist who has written 5 plays and who is well-known in the USSR and abroad, face destitution, the street, and ruin.

—[Signed] M. Bulgakov, Moscow 28 March 1930

TO THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF VKP(b) (All-Russian Communist Party (Bolshevik)) I. V. STALIN

O muse! Our Song is sung... And to the muse, I return the voice, And once again you will find blissful hours, Gathering corn ears from your own expansive tract. — Nekrasov

Introduction

Dear Iosif Vissarionovich!

About a year and a half have passed since I became silent. Now, when I feel very seriously ill, I would like to ask you to become my first reader... — [Start of a letter begun in 1931]

TO THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE VKP(b)

IOSIF VISSARIONOVICH STALIN

Dear Iosif Vissarionovich!

"The later, the more the stronger the desire has grown within me to be a modern writer. But, at the same time, I have seen that, when portraying modern times, one cannot be in that well-tuned and serene state which is necessary for the carrying out an important and well-structured scholarly work.

"The present is too much alive, too much in motion, too irritating; the pen of the writer imperceptibly shifts to satire.

"...It has always seemed to me that some kind of self-sacrifice faces me in my life and that, precisely to be of service to my native land, I will have to be educated far away from it."

"...I have known only that I go not at all in order to enjoy foreign parts, but rather to endure, exactly as if I had a presentiment that I will learn the value of Russia only outside Russia and will come to love her from far away." — N. Gogol.

I passionately ask you to intercede on my behalf before the government of the USSR with regard to sending me on foreign leave during the period from 1 June to 1 October 1931.

I want to advise you that, after my silence of a year and a half, new creative plans have taken flame, with an irresistible force, within me and that these plans are both broad and strong, and I ask the government to provide me the possibility of carrying them out.

Since the end of 1930 I have suffered a serious form of neurological malady, with attacks of fright and deep melancholy, and I am now near my limit.

There are plans within me, but there is no physical strength, there are none of the conditions needed to carry out work.

I clearly understand the reason for my illness.

On the broad field of Russian literature in the USSR, I have been the one and only literary wolf. People have advised me to dye my skin. Ridiculous advice. Whether a wolf is dyed, whether a wolf is clipped, he still bears no resemblance to a poodle.

And they have treated me as they would a wolf. And for several years they have hunted me, according to the rules of a literary preserve, in a fenced yard.

I bear no malice, but I am very tired and, at the end of 1929, collapsed. Indeed, even a beast can grow tired.

The beast declared that he is no longer a wolf, no longer a writer. He repudiated his profession. He ceased to speak. This, let's say it straight out, is faintness of heart.

There is no such writer, that would stop talking. If he stopped talking, this means that he is not genuine.

And if a genuine one fell silent, he would perish.

The reason for my illness is many years of persecution, and then silence.

During the past year I have done the following:

despite very great difficulties, I transformed N. Gogol's poem "Dead Souls" into a play;

I worked as a director at the MKhT (Moscow Arts Theater) on rehearsals of this play;

I worked as an actor, taking the parts of actors who had become ill in these same rehearsals;

I was appointed a director in the MKhT for all this year's campaigns and revolutionary holidays;

I served in the Moscow TRAM (expansion not given), switching over from the day work of the MKhT to the evening TRAM work;

I left TRAM on March 31 when I felt that my brain was refusing to work and that I was not being useful to the TRAM;

I involved myself in a production at the Sanprosvet Theater (and will finish it in June);

and at nights I began to write.

But I overtaxed myself.

I am overtired.

All my impressions are alike, my ideas are bound in black, I am poisoned by melancholy and habitual irony.

During the years of my writing work, all citizens, non-party members and party members, again and again brought home to me that, from the very moment that I wrote and put out my first line and to the end of my life, I will never see other countries.

If this is so, the horizon is hidden for me, a higher school of writing has been taken from me, and I am deprived of the possibility of resolving immense questions for myself. A prisoner's psychology is implanted in me.

How will I sing of my country — the USSR?

Before writing you, I have weighed everything. It necessary for me to see the world and, having seen it, to return. Herein lies the key.

I say to you, Iosif Vissarionovich, that I have been very seriously warned by important figures in the arts who have travelled abroad that it is impossible for me to remain there.

They have warned me that, in the event that the government opens the door to me, I must be especially careful that this door does not accidentally close behind me and that my way back is not cut off, that the misfortune of an even worse prohibition of my plays does not result.

In the general opinion of all who have been seriously interested in my work, I would find it impossible in any land other than my own — the USSR, because I have taken 11 years from it.

And I am sensitive to such warnings, and the most weighty of them was from my wife who has been abroad and who told me, when I applied for exile, that she does not want to remain abroad and that I would perish there from melancholy in less than a year.

(I myself have never been abroad in my life. Information that I have been abroad, which is contained in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, is untrue.)

"The Soviet theater does not need such a Bulgakov," one critic wrote moralistically when they turned me down.

I do not know whether Soviet theater needs me, but I need the Soviet theater, as I need the air.

I ask the USSR government to let me go until autumn and to permit my wife Lyubov Yevgeniyevna Bulgakova to accompany me. I ask for the latter because I am seriously ill. I need to accompany someone who is close to me. I suffer attacks of fear when I am alone.

If any kind of additional explanation of this letter is necessary, I will give this to whomever calls me.

But, ending this letter, I want to say to you, Iosif Vissarionovich, that my dream as a writer is to be summoned to see you personally.

Believe me, this is not because I see this as the most promising possibility, but because your conversation with me by phone in April 1930 left a sharp impression in my mind.

You said: "Perhaps you really do need to go abroad...".

I have not been spoiled by conversations. Though touched by this phrase, I have been working very hard for a year as a director in Soviet theaters.

—[Signed] M. Bulgakov, 30 May 1931, Moscow

TO COMRADE STALIN — From dramatist and director of the USSR MKhAT imeni Gorkiy Mikhail Afanasievich Bulgakov

Dear Iosif Vissarionovich! Permit me to tell you what has happened with me:

1. At the end of April of this year I sent the chairman of the government commission which manages the Arts Theater an application in which I asked permission for a two-month trip abroad, accompanied by my wife, Yelena Sergeyevna Bulgakova.

This application indicated the purpose of my trip — I wanted to put together a book about a trip through Western Europe (in order, upon my return, to offer it for printing in the USSR).

And as I am actually suffering from exhaustion of the nervous system, connected with being sick as a result of my isolation, I also asked for permission for my wife to accompany me, with the proviso that she would leave my 7-year old stenson, who is being raised and supported by me, here for the two months.

Having sent off this application, I expected one of two answers, that is, either permission for the trip or denial of it, thinking that there could be no third one.

However, the unexpected happened, that is, a third answer.

On 17 May they called me by telephone and the following conversation took place:

"You have submitted an application concerning foreign travel?"

"Yes."

"Go to the International Department (ID) of the Moscow District Executive Committee (Mosgubispolkom) and fill out a questionnaire for you and your wife."

"When is it necessary to do this?"

"As soon as possible, since your case will be handled on the 21st or the 22nd."

In an attack of joy, I did not even ask whom I was speaking to and immediately reported with my wife to the ID of the executive committee, where I introduced myself. The official, having heard that they called me to the ID by telephone, asked me to wait a moment, went into the next room, and, when he returned, asked me to fill out the questionnaires.

When they were filled out, he took them, having attached two photographs to each. He did not take any money, saying:

"The passports will be free."

He did not take our Soviet internal passports, saying:

"That will be later, when you exchange them for foreign ones."

And then he added, literally, the following:

"You will receive the passports very soon, since we have instructions concerning you. You could have received them today, but it is too late. Call me in the morning of the 18th."

I said:

"But the 18th is not a work day."

Then he answered:

"Well, on the 19th."

On 19 May, in the morning, in answer to our call, they said the following:

"We still do not have the passports. Call at the end of the day. If the passports are here, the passport clerk will issue them to you."

Our call at the end of the day ascertained that the passports were not there and they suggested that we phone on the 23rd.

On 23 May, I personally went with my wife to the ID, where I learned that there were no passports. The official made an enquiry by telephone and then suggested that we call on 25 or 27 May.

Then I pricked up my ears somewhat and asked the official whether, specifically, there were instructions concerning me and whether I had not heard correctly on 17 May.

To this I received the following answer:

"You yourself will understand that I cannot tell you whose instructions these are, but there are instructions concerning you and your wife, just as concerning the writer Pilnyak."

Then and there, all of my doubts disappeared and my joy became unlimited.

Still another confirmation of the existence of instructions for me soon followed. I learned from the theater that they had said in the Central Executive Committee that "The case of the Bulgakovs is being arranged."

At this time they were congratulating me that my writer's dream, of many years standing, concerning travel, which is necessary for every writer, had been realized.

Meanwhile, in the executive committee ID, they continued, from day to day, to put off an answer concerning the passports, to which I reacted with total equability in the belief that, no matter how long they were delayed, there would be passports.

On 7 June, a courier from the Arts Theater went to the ID with a list of those who were supposed to receive foreign passports. The theater politely also included me and my wife in this list, although I had submitted my own application separately from the theater.

The courier returned in the afternoon and just from his distracted and confused expression I could see that something had happened.

The courier reported that the passports had been given to the artists, that he had them in his pocket, but, with regard to my wife and me, he said that we had been REFUSED passports.

On the very next day, without any delay, the ID received certification that citizen M. A. Bulgakov had been refused permission to go abroad.

After this, in order not to have to listen to expressions of sympathy, surprise, and the like, I headed home, understanding only one thing, that I had ended up in a distressing and comical situation, inappropriate to my years.

2.

The injury done me in the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee is all the more serious as my 14 years of service in the MKhAT provides no basis for it, and therefore I ask for your intercession. — 10 June 1934

To IOSIF VISSARIONOVICH STALIN

From dramatist Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov

Dear Iosif Vissarionovich!

Permit to turn to you with a request concerning the dramatist Nikolay Robertovich Erdman, who spent the entire 3-year period of his exile in the cities of Yeniseysk and Tomsk and who, at the present time, is living in the city of Kalinin.

Convinced that literary gifts are extremely valuable in our fatherland and knowing at the same time that the writer N. Erdman is now denied the possibility of applying his skills as a result of the negative attitude toward him which has been created and has been sharply expressed in the press, I am taking the liberty of asking you to turn your attention to his fate.

In the hope that the lot of the writer N. Erdman will be eased if you should consider this request, I fervently request this, so that it will be made possible for N. Erdman to return to Moscow and to work without impediment in the field of literature, having been freed from his condition of isolation and intellectual oppression.

—[Signed] M. Bulgakov, Moscow, 4 February 1938

The situation which developed around Bulgakov in the end of the 1920's and the beginning of the 30's has been covered in sufficient detail in publications during recent years.(2) The writer's situation was extremely difficult in all regards: His works were not printed, his plays were not staged, and he was deprived of his beloved work in the MKhAT. His persecution was accomplished methodically, crudely, and vulgarly. According to a count by the writer himself, of 301 reviews of his work, 298 were "hostilely abusive" The M. A. Bulgakov archive collection preserves an album containing "examples" of such RAPP (Russian Association of Proletarian Writers) production. Here are several of them.(3)

"The stories of M. Bulgakov are undiluted and consistent; they have a single mood and a single theme. This theme is the depressing senselessness, the confusion and insignificance of Soviet life, the chaos engendered by communist attempts to build a new society... He appears as a writer who does not even clothe himself in the colors of a fellow-traveller. Not only our critics and bibliographers, but our publishing houses should be on their guard, and Glavlit the more so!" (Leopold Averbakh, 20 Sept 1925)

"All kinds of Bulgakovisms or full-blooded Soviet themes? This is the question which confronts the MKhAT today, on the day of its 13th anniversary!" (O. Litovskiy, 27 Oct 1926)

"This running backwards must be stopped. The presentation of the play "Running" is an attempt to force a white-guardist apology into the Soviet theater, onto today's stage, to show to the Soviet viewer... an icon of white guard martyrs drawn by an icon-dauber." (I. Bachelis, 23 Oct 1928)

"We will deal a blow to Bulgakovism". (I. Kor, 15 Nov 1928)

It should be noted that criticism of Bulgakov came from other writers and some representatives of workers' organizations and economic managers, who considered contemporary literature to be of little use to the working masses. For example, V. Avanesov, a well-known bolshevik and at that time one of the directors of the VSNKh (All-Union Council of the National Economy), wrote: "I read almost no modern Russian literature, and if I sometimes have occasion to look through snatches of it, then I must frankly confess that I am unable to find anything in it which could not only satisfy me, but would make this literature in any way useful for the workers and peasants of the USSR." As an example, he named the works of Bulgakov and Pilnyak, from which, in his view, the workers could hardly extract "anything positive".(4)

In the very beginning of 1929, when the MKhAT, despite the opposition of the Glavrepertkom, staged Bulgakov's new play "The Running", I. V. Stalin read it and, in his "Answer to Bill-Belotserkovskiy" expressed his opinion about Bulgakov's dramatic writings:

"To T. Bill-Belotserkovskiy!

I am very late in writing. But better late than never.

1) I consider even the posing the question of the "rights" and the "lefts" in belles-lettres (and this also means in the theater) to be incorrect. The concept of "right" or "left" at the present time in our country is a party concept, and essentially an internal party one. The "rights" or the "lefts", these are people who deviate to one side or another from the purely party line. It would be strange therefore to use these concepts in such a non-party and incomparably broader area as fiction, the theater, etc. These concepts can still be applied to one or another party (communist) circle within fiction. Inside such a circle there can be "rights" and "lefts". But to apply them to fine literature at the present stage of its development, when all sorts and kinds of currents exist, up to and including anti-Soviet and directly counterrevolutionary ones, means to turn all concepts upside down. It would be most correct to operate in fiction with the concepts of the class order, or even with the concepts of "soviet", "anti-soviet", "revolutionary", "counterrevolutionary", and so on.

2) It follows from this that I cannot consider "golovanovism" to be either a "right" or a "left" danger — it lies outside the limits of party currents. "Golovanovism" is a phenomenon of an anti-Soviet sort. It does not follow from this, of course, that Golovanov cannot correct himself, that he cannot free himself from his mistakes, that it is necessary to persecute and torment him, even when he is ready to bid farewell to his mistakes, that it is necessary to force him, in this way, to go abroad.

Or, for example, Bulgakov's "The Running", which also cannot be considered a manifestation of either a "left" or "right" danger. "The Running" is a manifestation of an

attempt to evoke pity, if not sympathy, for certain levels of the anti-Soviet emigration, an attempt to justify or partially justify the case of the white guardists. "The Running", in the form that takes, is an anti-Soviet phenomenon.

However, I would not have anything against the staging of "The Running" if Bulgakov would add to his eight dreams one or two other dreams, in which he would portray the internal social mainsprings of the civil war in the USSR, so that the viewer could understand that all these, in their own way, honest seraphim and assorted assistant professors did not find themselves kicked out of Russia at the whim of the bolsheviks, but because they were a burden on the people (despite their own "honesty"), that the bolsheviks, in driving away these "honest" proponents of exploitation, were carrying out the will of the workers and peasants and therefore were acting entirely correctly.

3) Why are Bulgakov's plays so often presented on the stage? It must be because there is a shortage of our own plays suitable for presentation. Among the blind, "Turbine Days" is king. Of course, it is very easy to "criticize" and den. and suppression as regards nonproletarian literature. But the easiest thing should not be considered the best. The matter does not lie in suppression, but in driving, step-by-step, the old and the new nonproletarian trash from the stage by means of competition, by creating true, interesting, and artistic plays having a soviet character which are capable of replacing it. And competition is an important and a serious matter, for it is only in a competitive situation that our proletarian literature can take shape and crystallize.

As regards the play "Turbine Days" in particular, it is really not so bad, because it does more good than harm. Do not forget that the main impression which remains with the viewer of this play is the impression which is favorable for the bolsheviks: "if even such people as the Turbines find it necessary to put down their arms and to submit to the will of the people, having declared that their cause has been finally lost, this means that the bolsheviks are invincible, that there is nothing that can be done about them, the bolsheviks." "Turbine Days" is a demonstration of the all-shattering force of bolshevism.

Of course this demonstration is in no way the "fault" of the author. But what does this have to do with us?

4) It is true that comrade Sviderskiy quite often allows the most unbelievable mistakes and distortions. But is also true that the Repertkom, in its own work, allows no fewer mistakes, even if on the other side. Remember the "Blood-Red Island" and trash similar to it, for some reason readily passed for the actually bourgeois Kamerniy Theater.

5) As regards "rumors" about "liberalism", we had better not talk about this - Let Moscow's merchants' wives concern themselves with "rumors". [signed] I. Stalin, 2 February 1929(5)

The fate of "The Running" had, of course, been decided, and it was presented for the first time only many years after the death of the playwright, in 1957. Other plays by Bulgakov also began to disappear from the posters — "Zoykin's Apartment" ("Zoykina kvartira"), "Blood-Red Island", "Turbine Days". And at the end of 1929 the dramatist received official notification from the Glavrepertkom that all his plays had been rejected for presentation.

On the outside, Bulgakov remained calm during this time which was very difficult for him. He never made any reply to the critical attacks. Y. S. Bulgakova, in a letter to the chief editor of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, when pointing out the crude mistakes that had been made in Bulgakov's biography in the first edition of the encyclopedia, stressed that "he (Bulgakov) did not approach the encyclopedia with denial because the entire article had been written in the spirit of that evaluation of his creative work which was being promoted at the time by the literary circles headed by L. Averbakh, V. Kirshon, R. Pikel, F. Raskolnikov, V. Blyum, and others, and that M. A. Bulgakov, as a matter of principle, never replied to any of their public or newspaper statements." (6)

And he continued to work — with enthusiasm, productively, and with talent. He began a "novel about the devil" and wrote the autobiographical story "To a Secret Friend" ("Taynomu drugu") and the play about Moliere. But his letters to his brother Nikolay tell what this cost him, what a difficult spiritual state he found himself in — to the point of sensing the imminence of his own death.

On 24 August 1919 he wrote:

"Now I tell you, my brother, my situation is not good. All my plays have been forbidden for presentation in the USSR: they are not printing a single line of my literary work.

"My destruction as a writer was completed in 1929. I have made a final effort and have submitted an application to the USSR government, in which I asked to go abroad, with my wife, for any period of time. (7) In my heart, there is no hope... There are already evil rumors circulating around me that I am doomed in every sense... In the event that my application is rejected, we can consider the game ended; we can pick the cards, and put out the light.

"I am forced to sit in Moscow and not write, because they not only do not want see my plays, they do not even want to see my name. Without any faintness of heart, my

brother. I say to you that the question of my death — this is only a question of time if, of course, a miracle does not occur. But miracles happen rarely.

"I very much ask that you write me whether this letter is understandable to you, but do not, in any case, write me any words of encouragement and sympathy, in order not to alarm my wife.

"Make it a more cheerful letter.

"It is not good that this spring I felt tired, that I was attacked by indifference. Indeed, there is a limit..."(8)

16 January 1930:

"...I earnestly ask that you not be angry about the break in correspondence. Please, write more often. Please, do not remain silent. My last silence was a result of a worsening in my situation and, related to this, of an inability to communicate, and also to write.

"About myself"

"All my literary works have perished, and also my plans. I am doomed to silence and, very possibly, to total starvation. Under incredibly difficult conditions during the second half of 1929, I wrote a play about Moliere. It was greeted by the best specialists in Moscow as the strongest of my 5 plays. But all information indicates that they will not allow it on the stage. The torture concerning it has already been going on for a month and a half, despite the fact that this is the 17th-Century Moliere, that I have in no way concerned myself with modern times in it.

If this play perishes, there will be no way to save me. I am already suffering from poverty. I am without protection and help. I say entirely soberly that my ship is sinking, the water is reaching me on the bridge. I must drown bravely. I ask you to take heed of what I say... I am tormented, I cannot work. It is very difficult..."(9)

21 February 1930:

"One thought is weighing on me, that, evidently, we will never in our lives see one another. My fate has been tangled and terrible. Now it is causing me to be silent, and for a writer this is the same thing as death.

"I have a question for you in return: does my literary work interest you. Write me about this. If it is even of a little interest... listen to the following and, if possible, with attention:

"I have tried to carry out my writing work under unbelievably difficult conditions, as I must. Now my work has been put aside. I see myself as a complex (my assumption) machine, the production of which is not needed in the USSR. This is too clear to me. They have demonstrated it and are now still demonstrating it as

regards my play about Moliere. At nights I have torturously racked my brains, thinking of ways to save myself. But nothing is clear to me. To whom, I think, should I write another application?... On 15 March, the first payment to the Finance Inspectorate is due (income tax for last year). I suppose that, if some kind of miracle does not happen, not a single unbroken article will remain in my small and damp apartment (incidentally, I have been suffering from rheumatism for the past several years). Material goods are of little importance to me. Well, the chairs, the cups, the devil take them. I am worried about the books! My library is poor but, nevertheless, without books I am dead. When I work, I work very seriously — I need to read a lot..."(10)

But a further blow awaited Bulgakov: On 18 March 1930, the notification came from the Glavrepertkom that presentation of his most recent work — the play about Moliere ("Servitude of the Hypocrites") — had also been forbidden.

Several days later, on 28 March, M. Bulgakov sent a letter to the government.

This letter clearly will continue to be at the center of attention of Bulgakov researchers for many years. It contains the literary and political portrait of the artist as he himself drew it. It seems necessary to us to turn attention here to the following basic characteristics of this portrait of the writer. We have before us a man of honesty and great personal courage, whom no power could force to become a "helot, panegyrist, and frightened servant."

We cannot but agree here with the remark of S. Lyandres: "We can today understand and forgive the sharpness of M. Bulgakov's tone — the forced sharpness of a person who had been taken to the final extreme, and we cannot help seeing in it a desire to serve the motherland." In a letter he directly says of himself: "I offer the USSR a completely honest director-specialist and actor, who, without a shade of hostility, undertakes to conscientiously present any play, beginning with the plays of Shakespeare right up to and including the plays of the present day."

The following fact also testifies to this position taken by the writer. Having familiarized himself with a translation he had received of "Zoykin's Apartment", which they were preparing to show in Paris, and having discovered various distortions in it, Bulgakov wrote his brother: "First of all, I ask you with all seriousness to personally verify the French text of "Zoykin" and to assure me that the producers have not and will not permit any kinds of distortions or personal concoctions which bear an anti-Soviet character and, consequently, are totally unacceptable and unpleasant for me as a citizen of the USSR. This is the most important thing." (11)

The telephone conversation between Stalin and Bulgakov took place soon after this letter was sent, on 18 April.

Here is how L.Ye. Belozerskaya describes this event: "First about the telephone conversation with Stalin. I answered the phone. Stalin's secretary Tovstukha was calling from the Central Committee. I called Mikhail Afanasyevich, and then busied myself with housework. Mikhail Afanasyevich took the receiver and suddenly shouted "Lyubasha" so loudly and excitedly that I rushed headlong to the telephone (we had ear phones separate from the telephone). I am at the present time the only one who listened to this conversation. Stalin was on the line. He spoke in a voice that was difficult to hear, with a clearly Georgian accent and referred to himself in the third person. He suggested to Bulgakov that "perhaps, you want to go abroad?" (12)

A more detailed account of this conversation is given in the memoirs of Ye. S. Bulgakova: "When I became acquainted with them (with the Bulgakovs — V.L.)... they were in a difficult financial situation. This is to say nothing about M (ikhail) Afanasyevich's awful mental state... Then he wrote a letter to the government... On 3 April, when I was with M.A. at Pirogovska, F. Kioppe and P. Sokolov (the former, it seems, was the literary chief at TRAM, and the latter the director) came there with contracts for M.A. to come as a director to TRAM... On 18 April, at about 6-7 o'clock, he came running, excited, to our apartment (with Shilovskiy) on Rzhnevskiy Boulevard and told us the following. He had laid down for a nap after dinner, as always, but suddenly the telephone had rung and Lyuba (Belozerskaya — V.L.) had called him, saying that they were calling for him from the Central Committee.

M.A. did not believe it, thinking that it was a practical joke (as sometimes happened at the time) and, with rumpled hair and annoyed, took the phone and heard:

"Mikhail Afanasyevich Bulgakov?"

"Yes, yes."

"Comrade Stalin will speak with you now."

"What? Stalin? Stalin?"

And here he heard a voice with an obvious Georgian accent.

"Yes, this is Stalin speaking with you. Hello, comrade Bulgakov" (or, Mikhail Afanasyevich; I do not precisely recall).

"Hello, Iosif Vissarionovich."

"We have received your letter. We have read it with the comrades. You will have a favorable answer to it... And perhaps it is true — You ask to go abroad? What, are you very tired of us?"

(M. A. said that such a question was so unexpected — as he had not even expected a call — that he became confused and did not answer immediately):

"I have thought a great deal recently — can a Russian writer live outside the motherland. And it seems to me that he cannot."

"You are right. I think so too. Where do you want to work? In the Arts Theater?"

"Yes, I would like that. But I spoke about this and they refused me."

"Well, you submit an application there. It seems to me that they will agree. It would be useful for us to meet, to have a talk with you."

"Yes, yes! Iosif Vissarionovich, it is very necessary for me to talk with you."

"Yes, it is necessary to find a time and to meet, we must. And now, I wish you all the best." (13)

After the conversation with Stalin, Bulgakov was accepted as a director in the MKhAT. In the evenings he worked in the TRAM. After a short time he wrote the scenario for Gogol's poem "Dead Souls". Testimony of the mood of the writer and of the changes that had occurred for the better is found in his letters to K. S. Stanislavskiy. Of particular interest is the letter of 6 August 1930, in which he says:

"Dear Konstantin Sergeyevich,

"Having returned from the Crimea, where I have been treating my sick nerves after the last two, very difficult years for me, I am writing you these simple and unofficial lines.

"The prohibition of all my plays forced me to turn to the government of the USSR with a letter in which I asked them either to send me abroad, if it has already become impossible for me to work as a dramatist, or to afford me the possibility of becoming a director in a Soviet theater.

In my letter to the government I wrote that "I ask for the best school, headed by the masters K. S. Stanislavskiy and V.I. Nemirovich-Danchenko. My letter was given consideration and I was afforded the possibility of submitting an application to the Arts Theater and was signed on in it.

After my deep sorrow concerning the demise of my plays, things became better for me when — after a long pause — I, now in a new capacity, crossed the threshold of the theater which you created for our country's glory.

Konstantin Sergeyevich, accept, with a pure spirit, your new director. Believe that he loves your Arts Theater." (14)

It would seem that the situation had developed favorably for Bulgakov. Nonetheless, he did not find mental peace. His uplifted mood during the first months after his conversation with Stalin and after establishing himself in the theater was replaced by dismay and depression. Ill health and extreme over-fatigue showed their effects. But most important was his indefinite status as a dramatist. Indeed, as formerly, not one of his plays was presented. Not a single line appeared in print.

And again the idea came to him to write to I.V. Stalin, to explain all over again. It appears that M. Bulgakov had in mind a long and comprehensive letter, in which he proposed to openly expound his views on the writer and on writing, on his lofty calling. This plan of Bulgakov is evidenced by the still existing beginning of his letter, with an epigraph from Nekrasov. It is dated in the beginning of 1931. It is difficult to say why it remained unfinished, but perhaps the author was uncertain that it would be understood.

Meanwhile, there was no brightening evident on the literary horizon, his mental condition deteriorated ("I am poisoned by melancholy"), he had no strength for work. Even for personal, family affairs... All this forced M. Bulgakov, in May of 1931, to write personally to Stalin with a request for two or three month foreign travel authorization.

But the main idea of the letter was again the same — about his own calling, about the tragedy of a writer who is forced to be silent: "There is no such writer who stops talking. If he has ceased to speak, this means that he is not genuine. And if a genuine one ceases to speak, he will die."

And the second thought, related to the first, is about service to the motherland: "I do not know whether the Soviet theater needs me, but I need the Soviet theater, as I need the air."

There was no answer from Stalin to this letter. Bulgakov did not receive permission to leave. But, by the end of the year, his literary affairs began to improve somewhat. In October 1931 "Moliere" was accepted for presentation and, in March of the following year, rehearsals began. In the beginning of 1932 they phoned from MKhAT and informed him of the revival of "Turbine Days". "It is unpleasant for me to confess," Bulgakov wrote his friend P. S. Popov when he learned of the show's rehabilitation, "that this news has made me happy. My physical state has grown bad. I experienced a burst of joy, but then immediately there was also my melancholy. My heart, my heart! Yes, my heart has grown tired of waiting..."

The idea of a foreign trip did not desert Bulgakov: with it, he associated new ideas, a change of impressions, a chance to become well again. In a letter to P.S. Popov he wrote: "For a long time now, I have been talking with Lyusa about what sort of trip it would be possible to

write about. And I recalled the unforgettable "Frigate Palladu" (Fregat Palladu) and how Grigorovich rolled into Paris 18 years ago! Oh, if only it would come to pass!"

In the end of April 1934, Bulgakov applied for a two-month foreign trip. Possibly, his hope for a positive decision was based on the particular attention paid to him on the part of "the high leadership". In Ye. S. Bulgakova's diary, from 27 March 1934, there is the following notation: "This afternoon I went to the MKhAT after Mikhail Afanasyevich. While I waited for him in the corridor... Nikolay Vasilovich Yegorov approached me and said that Stalin had been at the theater several days earlier and had asked, among other things, about Bulgakov, whether he was working in the theater." (15)

"I guarantee to you, Yelena (Sergeyevna), that, among the members of the government, they consider that our best play is "Turbine Days". (16)

The unexpected rejection of their trip abroad literally shook the Bulgakovs. For more than a month, they were unable to pull themselves together. "Oh, the shock was a very good one!", Bulgakov wrote P.S. Popov on 6 June 1934. (17)

Bulgakov expressed his indignation at the rude, bureaucratic refusal to issue their passports in his letter to Stalin. The diary of Ye. S. Bulgakova contains the following note in this regard: "on 20 June (1934), M.S. was in a very bad state... he wrote a letter about this to Stalin, and I took it to the Central Committee. (18) There was no answer to the letter.

It should be noted that Bulgakov appealed to Stalin not only for the resolution of his own problems, but that he also helped other writers to compose letters. On 30 October 1935, Bulgakov was approached for help by Anna Akhmatova, whose husband and son had been arrested. Together, they prepared a letter to Stalin. (19)

Thus, in February 1938, Bulgakov turned to Stalin with a request to "ease the lot" of the dramatist Nikolay Erdman, with whom he had been friends in recent years. (20) Very frequently, in the diaries of Ye. S. Bulgakova, one finds notations that "Misha decided to write a letter to Stalin," "Today, Misha reached a firm decision to write a letter about his fate as a writer," "Misha is working on a letter to Stalin," and so on. Unfortunately, not all these letters are preserved in the archives of the writer. It will require a great deal of work on the part of researchers to uncover this specific and very important epistolary legacy of Bulgakov.

The published letters are preserved in copies and handwritten rough drafts in the Manuscript Department of the USSR State Library (imeni V. I. Lenin (OP GVL), f. 562.k. 19, ex. 20, 30, 33).

Footnotes

(1) Bulgakov's orthography is consistently maintained in the titles of his works referred to.

(2) See S. Lyandres, "The Russian Writer Cannot Live without the Motherland... (Materials for a Creative Biography of M. Bulgakov)", *VOPROSY LITERATURY*, No 9 1966; V. Petelin, "Memory of an Undying Heart", Moscow 1970; I. F. Belza, "Geneology of 'The Master and Margarita'", *KONTEKST* 1978, Moscow 1978; by the same author, "On the Question of Pushkin's Traditions in Our Country's Literature (Using M.A. Bulgakov's Works as an Example)", *KONTEKST* 1980, Moscow 1981; M. Chudakova, "The Archives of M.A. Bulgakov. Materials for a Creative Biography of the Writer" in the publication "Transactions of the Manuscript Department of the USSR State Library imeni V.I. Lenin (LLR: [Lenin Library Reference])", issue 37, Moscow 1976; Lidia Yznovskaya, "The Creative Path of Mikhail Bulgakov", Sovetskiy Pisatel publishing house, Moscow 1983, etc.

(3) LLR [Lenin Library Reference], a [archive] 562, c [catalogue] 27, s.u. [storage unit] 2, p [paper] 1-816

(4) LLR, a. 562, s.u. 2, p. 65

(5) I.V. Stalin, *Collected Works*, vol. 11 Politizdat publishing house Moscow 1949, pp 326-329

(6) LLR, a. 562, c. 33, s.u. 5, p. 1

(7) This refers to a letter to I. V. Stalin, M.I. Kalinin, A.I. Sviderskiy (the chief of Glaviskusstva), and A. M. Gorkiy, which was sent in June 1929 and which we do include in full here. From the content of the letter it is evident that the writer was not so much interested in a trip abroad as he needed protection from totally unrestrained "literary snipers". The letter states, in particular, that "to the extent that I have made my works public, the critics have turned increasingly more attention toward me... the press reviews have become increasingly savage and have finally assumed the character of frenzied abuse... My works "Turbine Days" and "Zoykin's Apartment" were stolen and taken abroad. In the city of Riga, one of the publishing houses made additions to my novel "White Guard", putting out under my name a book with an illiterate ending. They have begun to misappropriate my honoraria abroad... My strength has been broken down..."

(8) LLR, a. 562, s.u. 11, pp. 4-5

(9) LLR, a. 562, c. 19, s.u. 12, ll 1-2

(10) LLR, a. 562, c. 19, s.u. 12, ll 6-7

(11) LLR, a. 562, c. 19, s.u. 17, p. 1

(12) LLR, a. 562, c. 59, s.u. 5, p. 106

(13) LLR, a. 562, c. 29, s.u. 12, pp. 9-11

(14) LLR, a. 562, c. 29, s.u. 34, pp. 9-11

(15) N. V. Yegorov, MKhAT director

(16) LLR, a. 562, c. 29, s.u. 5, p. 2

(17) LLR, a. 218, c. 1269, s.u. 4, p. 31

(18) LLR, a. 562, c. 29, s.u. 5, pp. 38-39

(19) see LLR.f. 562, c. 29, s.u. 6, pp. 73-74

(20) LLR, c. 28, s.u. 26, ll 10-11: Following his exile, Nikolay Erdman lived in the city of Kalinin. In the late diaries of Ye. S. Bulgakova there is the following curious notation: "I have recalled a story told me by A(leksandr Nikolayevich) Tikhonov. He once went with Gorkiy (whose employ he was in) to Stalin to intercede for Erdman's "The Suicide". Stalin said to Gorkiy: "What do you mean! I have nothing against it. Look, Stanislavskiy writes here that the theater likes the play. Please, let's put it on, if you want. Personally, I don't like the play. Erdman is superficial, he concerns himself only with the surface. Take Bulgakov! He takes a healthy stance. He goes against the grain! (He showed with his hand — by his intonation.) This I like! Tikhonov told me this in Tashkent in 1942 and in Moscow after the evacuation — I met him near the MKhAT." (LLR, a. 562, c. 29, s.u. 12, p.12).

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Okt'yabr", 1987
13032

MOSCOW NEWS Republishes Lenin Interview
PM141315 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 40, 4 Oct 87 pp 8-9

[Unsigned article: "Questions to Vladimir Lenin"]

[Text] "The Crisis Has Matured" is the title of an article written by Lenin on September 29, 1917 and published on the front page of the Bolshevik newspaper *Rabochiy Put* (Workers' Path) on Saturday, October 7. On top of the page is a banner headline in large letters: "Comrade workers, soldiers and peasants! Get ready for the October 20 All-Russian Congress of Soviets! Convene at once regional Congresses of Soviets!"

[Question] What crisis is meant here? The events taking place in the spring and summer of 1917 caused crises at least three times. This was the case late in April, on June 8 and at the beginning of July...

Vladimir LENIN: Things are not as they were before April 20-21, June 9, July 3, for then it was a matter of spontaneous excitement which we, as a party, either failed to comprehend (April 20) or held back and shaped into a peaceful demonstration (June 9 and July 3)... At

that time the majority of the class-conscious workers did not raise the question of the last decisive struggle at all. As for the unenlightened and very broad masses, there was neither a concerted effort nor the resolve born out of despair; there was only a spontaneous excitement with the naive hope of "influencing" Krenskiy and the bourgeoisie by "action", by a demonstration pure and simple.

[Question] But even among the members of the Party Central Committee there are people who say that "there is no mood for street demonstrations among the masses". Isn't it worth heeding these voices?

Vladimir LENIN: Those who, in arguing about the mood of the masses, blame them for their own personal spinelessness, are in a hopeless position. The masses are divided into those who are consciously biding their time and those who unconsciously are ready to sink into despair; but the masses of the oppressed and the hungry are not spineless. The crucial point of the revolution in Russia has undoubtedly arrived.

In a peasant country, and under a revolutionary, republican government which enjoys the support of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties that only yesterday dominated petty-bourgeois democracy, a peasant revolt is developing.

Incredible as this is, it is a fact.

[Question] And on the basis of this fact alone a conclusion on a crisis is made?

Vladimir LENIN: It is obvious that if in a peasant country, after seven months of a democratic republic, matters could come to a peasant revolt, it irrefutably proves that the revolution is suffering nationwide collapse, that it is experiencing a crisis of unprecedented severity, and that the forces of counterrevolution have gone the limit... In the face of such a fact as a peasant revolt all other political symptoms, even were they to contradict the fact that a nationwide crisis is maturing, would have no significance whatsoever.

[Question] Let's assume that the linking of a peasant revolt with that of workers in Petrograd and Moscow, where the majority in the Soviets belongs to the Bolsheviks, is a major force. But are there also other forces on which the success or defeat of a revolution depends?

Vladimir LENIN: Let us take the army, which in war-time plays an exceptionally big role in all state affairs. We find that the army in Finland and the fleet in the Baltic have completely parted ways with the government. We have the testimony of the officer Dubasov, a non-Bolshevik, who speaks in the name of the whole front and declares in a manner more revolutionary than that of any Bolsheviks that the soldiers will not fight any longer.

[Question] What, under such circumstances, may the forthcoming Congress of Soviets provide?

Vladimir LENIN: To "wait" for the Congress of Soviets is idiocy, for the Congress will give nothing, and can give nothing! First defeat Krenskiy, then call the Congress.

[Question] Let's agree that this viewpoint is the only correct one. Why does the Party's Central organ—"Rabochiy Put", publishing the article "The Crisis Has Matured", on the same page call for preparing for the Congress of Soviets?

Vladimir LENIN: We must... admit the truth that there is a tendency, or an opinion, in our Central Committee and among the leaders of our Party which favours waiting for the Congress of Soviets, and is opposed to taking power immediately, is opposed to an immediate insurrection. That tendency, or opinion must be overcome.

Otherwise, the Bolsheviks will cover themselves with eternal shame and destroy themselves as a party.

To refrain from taking power now... to confine ourselves... to "fighting for the Congress", is to doom the revolution to failure.

[Question] Is this the way the question is being brought before the Central Committee?

Vladimir LENIN: The Central Committee has even left unanswered the persistent demands I have been making for such a policy... The Central Organ is deleting from my articles all references to such glaring errors on the part of the Bolsheviks... I am compelled to regard this as a "subtle" hint at the unwillingness of the Central Committee even to consider this question, a subtle hint that I should keep my mouth shut, and as a proposal for me to retire.

I am compelled to tender my resignation from the Central Committee, which I hereby do, reserving for myself freedom to campaign among the rank and file of the Party and at the Party Congress.

This is what Lenin, who was underground, wrote on September 29, 1917, three and a half weeks before the armed uprising in Petrograd. On October 10 he attended the session of the RSDLP Central Committee, made a report and tabled a draft resolution beginning with the following words: "The Central Committee recognizes that the international position of the Russian revolution... as well as the military situation... and the fact that the proletarian party has gained a majority in the soviets—all this, taken in conjunction with the peasant revolt and the swing of popular confidence towards our party... places the armed uprising on the order of the day."

The resolution on preparing for the uprising was adopted by 10 votes to two.

Restructuring of RSFSR Court System Discussed
PM161529 Moscow IZVESTIY in Russian 14 Oct 87
Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Self-critically and Exactingly"]

[Text] On 13 October the RSFSR Ministry of Justice and the RSFSR Supreme Court with the participation of the leaders of autonomous republic justice ministries, krayi-spolkom justice departments, chairman of supreme (ASSR), kray, oblast, and people's courts, and members of the legal profession examined progress in restructuring the work of courts and justice organs to improve their activity in combating crime, enhancing the standard of the legal service provided for the public, and strengthening the guarantees of legality and citizens' rights in the execution of justice. It was pointed out that the profound revolutionary transformations taking place in the country have had a beneficial effect on the state of law and order and determined positive changes in the republic's courts and justice organs. At the same time the attention of the leaders of justice organs and courts was drawn to the fact that restructuring in the courts is being carried out too slowly. Partiality, prejudice, and bias in favor of the prosecution have still not been universally eradicated, and callousness and bureaucratic delay in examining complaints and cases of wrongful conviction of citizens are occurring.

A package of measures designed to improve work with cadres of lawyers under the conditions of economic reform, democracy, and glasnost and enhance their professionalism and accountability for cases assigned to them was outlined. An extensive program has been drawn up to provide practical assistance to newly elected judges, to introduce everything of value, to strengthen courts' ties with labor collectives and public organizations, and to increase glasnost in legal establishments' activity.

T.G. Ivanova, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, leaders of union and republic law-enforcement organs, and representatives of science and the media took part in the conference.

PRAVDA Exposes Abuses by Moscow Militiamen
PM161104 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 87
Second Edition p 6

[G. Vokhmyanin report: "Duel Against Lawlessness: How Senior Lieutenant of Militia Natalya Averina Fought for 18 Months"]

[Text] Moscow—the 10-year-old Natasha asked her father:

"Dad, how did you win the Victory?"

The answer was brief: "We fought by the book. Everyone—from the private to the marshal."

"And what is the book?" his daughter persisted.

"The book? The main law of army life."

The father forgot that long-ago conversation, but Senior Lieutenant of Militia Natalya Averina remembers it to this day. Respect for the law has been part of her since childhood, she knows that there will be no order in life if the clear requirements of the law are violated. But a respectful attitude to the law led her... to the dock.

In the spring of 1985 N. Averina, superintendent of the Kosmos Hotel militia station, spoke out at a meeting of the collective, saying exactly what she thought about the work of her chief A. Kamyshnikov and his deputy A. Leonov. They had installed dozens of people from the Transcaucasian and Central Asian republics in the Kosmos Hotel, passing them off as militia workers. These people repaid their debt by warmly welcoming the firm "Kamyshnikov and Co." on the Black Sea coast. A subsequent investigation showed that Kamyshnikov and Leonov maintained unbusinesslike contacts with foreigners and gave large-scale parties for their subordinates in the hotel's currency bars. Because of low exactingness and serious shortcomings in work, drunkenness and other gross violations of socialist law and discipline were widespread in the subunit. The secretary of the station's Komsomol organization drowned in the hotel swimming pool while drunk, during working hours.

Kamyshnikov was expelled from the internal affairs organs. But it took more than 3 months to carry out this order, because of red tape. And all that time Kamyshnikov continued... to head the station, organizing the persecution of Averina. She—alone of the station's 60 staffers!—was excluded from operations connected with the holding of the World Festival of Youth and Students.

"Kamyshnikov," Natalya Artemovna writes to PRAVDA, "sent a letter to the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon prosecutor's office claiming that I appropriated items left behind by Kosmos guests. Staffers Vinogradov and Mukhanov from the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon prosecutor's office and representatives from 38 Petrovka [reference unknown—FBIS] carried out a search of my work place, after which a search was carried out at my apartment and the apartment of my parents, and an inventory was taken of my parents' property. In my parents' apartment a frame-up was carried out: They 'found' behind the books a 'secret dossier' belonging to me, rolled up into a tube. Immediately after this 'find' the search was stopped. On the same day criminal proceedings were brought against me."

It was claimed in the indictment that N. Averina "abused her official position, deliberately using it against the interests of the service and doing substantial damage to state interests." The "evidence" was presented to the people's court by A. Mukhanov, senior investigator at the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon prosecutor's office, who spent nearly 18 months disentangling the "Averina case."

The investigator's professional standard can be judged by how conclusive the case is, because there is no room for suppositions in an indictment. The indictment, which is Mukhanov's work, is full of opinions of the variety of "the investigation does not rule out the possibility." The possibility was not ruled out of malice aforethought, attempted blackmail by Averina, and other actions on her part which are not pretty in a law and order worker. By this method you can go on indefinitely making suppositions.

On the grounds that the "secret dossier" was wrapped in an issue of IZVESTIYA for 19 October 1981, investigator Mukhanov "established" that it was stolen by Averina in October 1981. Even so, what does that say about the state of affairs at the station, if for so many years nobody even wondered where such an important document might be? The investigator concluded that the secret document was stolen "with a view to pressuring and blackmailing the leadership of the Kosmos Hotel militia station," that is, Kamyshnikov, who at the time the criminal case was brought had already been expelled from the militia. How can you blackmail a leadership that is no longer there? And why did Averina not do so throughout the preceding years?

Investigator Mukhanov noted in the indictment: "By way of assessing the general conduct of the accused Averina during the preliminary investigation, it must be noted that she does not repent her deeds and from the first adopted a position of denying the irrefutable evidence of the illegal actions committed." But the truth prevailed, the "irrefutable evidence" collapsed piece by piece, and the investigator had to append to document after document: "The criminal case against Averina concerning the sale of material valuables to the commission store at reduced prices is dropped due to absence of elements of crime [sostav prestupleniya] in her actions," "...the case concerning the appropriation of two vials of eau-de-cologne and two packets of chewing gum is dropped due to lack of evidence."

Law is the investigator's compass, that helps him to find the truth. Investigator A. Mukhanov aims such professional punches at the law that you cannot help wondering whether it is inappropriate for him to belong to the body of prosecutors. For him, the law exists, so to speak, in two dimensions: One is the generally accepted one, the other is for special purposes, when everything can be interpreted and turned upside down. That is why Mukhanov interprets his official duties too in his own way: Given that the leadership has signed a search warrant, given that it is in favor of bringing criminal proceedings, he, the investigator, should prove that the leadership of Dzerzhinskiy Rayon prosecutor's office has not made a mistake. It costs him nothing to go against the law, but to go against the bosses' opinion is inconceivable. So if Averina has committed no fault, a fault must be manufactured.

Investigator Mukhanov did not know what fate lay in store for the house of cards he had built in the shape of an indictment. He had every confidence that the Dzerzhinskiy people's court, which is a few meters from the prosecutor's office, would take a "sympathetic" view of his search for evidence to compromise N. Averina. But the plan misfired: the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon people's court declined to examine the case, after which it was transferred to Tushinskiy people's court. There, the prosecuting attorney refused to... prosecute, and proposed sending the case for further investigation. It found its way to Krasnogvardeyskiy Rayon prosecutor's office, where it was dropped due to absence of elements of crime [sostav prestupleniya] in the act, although it should have been due to the absence of a criminal act [sobytiye prestupleniya]. This subtle distinction is the salvation of investigators Mukhanov and Goryunov (he was on the case for a while): Had their colleague from the Krasnogvardeyskiy prosecutor's office acknowledged that there was no criminal act, there would inevitably be a new criminal case, this time against those who had fabricated it. As it was, they were simply reprimanded: G. Skaredov, former Moscow prosecutor, gave A. Mukhanov a warning, while the other "guardian" of the law, S. Goryunov, because of his short time as investigator, was warned "of the impermissibility of violations of the law."

Natalya Artemovna spent nearly 2 years fighting these "lawmen" for justice, suffering irremediable losses. Some 2 months after the search, Averin's father, a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, could not stand the shame, and his heart stopped. Just before her state examinations, Averina, being under investigation, was expelled from the USSR MVD Academy. The family broke up, and she was out of a job for nearly 2 years (they dismissed her "for discrediting the title of militia worker," thus putting her on a level with Kamyshnikov). Her son was often ill, and she did not always have anyone to leave him with. The interrogations came one after another, and once an ambulance was forced to interrupt.

Averina was up against people who set no value on the law. And had it not been for her experience of practical work and the knowledge acquired at the USSR MVD Academy, who knows how the duel would have ended. But not everyone would be able to stand firm—not only for themselves, but first and foremost for the law. And what happens if the person under investigation is for the law, and against it are its arbitrary interpreters from Dzerzhinskiy Rayon prosecutor's office?

What enabled this fragile-looking young woman to stand her ground in such an unequal battle with lawlessness, tyranny, and prejudice? Unshakable faith in the irreversible nature of the post-April changes in our life, faith that the truth is always the truth, only it is no use waiting for justice to come of its own accord, just as it is no use believing that Kamyshnikov and his ilk will voluntarily quit their accustomed, comfortable places. And Natalya

Averina won. It was hard for her, but she did not concede one iota of her principles, and she also refused the deal kindly offered by the investigator:

"Would you like us to drop the case under an amnesty?"

Today, by order of the USSR minister of internal affairs, Senior Lieutenant of Militia (she would have been a captain by now, if all this had not happened) N. Averina is restored to the organs of law and order, has begun work at the Kosmos Hotel militia station, and has successfully passed her state examinations and entrance examinations to become an advanced student at the USSR MVD Academy.

Let us pay tribute to the courage of this woman, who has the right to walk with her head held high. She won a hard victory in the struggle against lawlessness. But it would be premature to bring this story to a close. Because although justice has, so to speak, triumphed, evil and its champions have in effect gone unpunished. Moreover, there is a new plate on A. Mukhanov's office door: "Assistant Prosecutor." Instead of condemnation of the wrongful, illegal style and methods of his work—a promotion. And it is not surprising that nobody has yet apologized to N. Averina. After all, what happened is not regarded as an extraordinary occurrence in the prosecutor's offices of Dzerzhinskii Rayon and Moscow. It is as if nothing illegal had taken place, as if 18 months had not been erased from the life of a totally innocent person...

Gorkom Chief Reprimanded for Obstructing Police

PM211019 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Oct 87 Second Edition

[Report by A. Petrishchev, secretary of Novgorod CPSU Obkom, under the rubric "Response to Criticism": "'Is It All Clear to You?'"]

[Text] The article "Is It All Clear to You?"—published in *Sovetskaya Rossiya* 8 August 1987—was examined at a CPSU obkom bureau session 22 September 1987. The criticism it contained was acknowledged as being objective.

Comrade V.A. Matveyev, first secretary of Staraya Russa party gorkom, really did not investigate in depth the essence of the matter when examining the complaints from Comrade N.P. Tikhonov, director of the "Anishino" Sovkhoz, and Comrade Yu.v. Rybin, chairman of the "Rossiya" Kolkhoz, about the actions of law-enforcement organ personnel. As a result, instead of making a strict party assessment of Comrades N.P. Tikhonov and Yu.v. Rybin, CPSU members who had committed law violations, Comrade V.A. Matveyev groundlessly interfered in the professional activity of prosecutor's office, court, and militia. Trying to get them to adopt decisions not based on law, he was rude to city prosecutor Comrade V.M. Serdyuk and people's court chairman Comrade V.P. Smirnov.

The party obkom bureau reprimanded Comrade V.A. Matveyev, CPSU member and first secretary of Staraya Russa CPSU Gorkom, with regard to the inadmissibility of undemocratic administration and unjustified interference in the professional functions of prosecutor's office, court, and militia organs. It demanded that he strictly fulfill the requirements of the CPSU Central Committee resolutions on leadership of the activities of law-enforcement organs.

In deciding the question of Comrade V.A. Matveyev's party responsibility, the CPSU obkom bureau took note of the fact that he was profoundly conscious of the illegality of his actions and had apologized to Comrades V.M. Serdyuk and V.P. Smirnov.

The Staraya Russa party gorkom bureau imposed party penalties on Comrade N.I. Mikheyev, CPSU member and chairman of the rayon agro-industrial association, for failing to take measures to halt the commissioning of unfinished projects and to Comrade N.P. Tikhonov, CPSU member and director of the "Anishino" Sovkhoz, for an unscrupulous approach to signing documents relating to work carried out and for commissioning projects in an unfinished state.

The action brought by the prosecutor was examined. By decision of the city people's court R264 was recovered from N.P. Tikhonov for the benefit of the "Anishino" Sovkhoz. Yu.v. Rybin, chairman of the "Rossiya" Kolkhoz, was also made administratively liable through a fine for allowing machine operators who had had their driver's licenses withdrawn to work.

Jurist Calls For Reform of Appeals Procedure in Criminal Cases

18000787 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 87 p 3

[Article by A. Move, chairman of the Criminal Law and Procedure Section of the Moscow Oblast Collegium of Lawyers: "Appeal on Trial"]

[Text] One of my case files is lying on my desk. On the title page of the cover are two lines, "Case Opened" and "Case Closed." On the first line it says "1980." On the second I finally wrote with relief: "1987."

It all began with a so-called appeal [zhaloba] on a supervisory basis. To it we received this terse answer on 12 February 1980: "Yuri Mikhaylovich R-v was sentenced to 11 years deprivation of freedom by verdict of the Novozavodskiy Rayon Peoples Court of the City of Chernigov on 17 October 1980 with proper grounds. His penalty was determined with due regard for the degree of guilt and his individual personality. There is no foundation for lodging a protest [protest] to modify the verdict, as is asked in the appeal. Chairman of the Chernigov Oblast Court N. Belyi."

And here are the last two answers (before the final one) received recently by the convicted man's mother: "Your appeal against the severity of the sentence has been reviewed and denied." The second response seems to amplify the first: "Your second appeal has been reviewed and denied." The first was signed by A. Bolabolchenko, chief of the Administration for Supervision of Court Hearings of Criminal Cases of the Ukrainian SSR Procurator's Office, and the second was signed by V. Prik, deputy UkSSR procurator. Between them, the above-mentioned first one and these two recent ones, there were about 20 (!) similar responses received in past years. Collected together in the legal file they make up a unique kind of collection of formalistic official pronouncements.

Now for the final chapter, the absolutely last response received from the USSR Procurator's Office: "The deputy procurator general of the USSR has submitted a protest on a supervisory basis to the judicial collegium for criminal matters of the UkSSR Supreme Court." In its order the collegium granted the protest and, finding the decision to be clearly unjust, reduced R-y's sentence to 7 years incarceration.

I am sure that if you now were to ask any of the officials who signed the above-mentioned pronouncements about one case or another, they would all answer that they did not look at the case personally, did not study it, and put their signature on it based on the report of a consultant or the zonal procurator who, of course, they had no reason not to trust.

So then the consultant was irresponsible in his examination? Or perhaps he was unable to master and correctly evaluate the voluminous material in the file? Especially when in the course of a day this same consultant has to decide and give findings on not one or two, but on several appeals? In a month this makes a fairly impressive figure, in some instances well beyond 100. Isn't it frightening to do this, just on faith, in others to put your signature on official forms?

But we should not be too quick to accuse officials of heartlessness, formalism, and bureaucratism. First let us try to get to the bottom of things, take a closer look at the conditions in which they have to work and decide the appeals of court decisions.

The procedure for accepting and deciding appeals of court sentences and decisions that have gone into effect (unlike formal [kassatsionaya] appeals, which are reviewed by the appropriate instance in a manner established by law) is not regulated by any legal rules. It was arbitrarily set by the heads of the corresponding court and procurator organs in forgotten times. And we have gotten used to it, accept it as something immutable, although it is not hard to realize that it suffers from a very significant shortcoming. This is that it gives rise to absolutely intolerable red tape as a

result of which improper verdicts or decisions are either not corrected at all or are not corrected promptly—sometimes not for many months or years.

Let us look at one of these instances, for example the RSFSR Supreme Court. Citizens begin the night before signing up on a handwritten list to be received by one of the court executives. The next morning about 20 "lucky ones" (even including lawyers, who for some reason sign up for reception in the common line) are received. No matter how they may want to, the chairman of the court or his deputy is not able to receive more petitioners. Moreover, it turns out that he is simply unable to decide the appeal, to figure it out. This is because the person conducting the reception does not have the main thing, the actual materials of the file on which the sentence being appealed was based, in front of him. They are kept in the court archives, often not even in Moscow but in some distant oblast or kray. But even if these materials were at hand during the reception, they are often several large volumes, and how can a responsible lawyer figure them out in 30 minutes? He cannot, of course. Therefore, the so-called reception comes down to simply deciding the question of whether to demand that the case be called for review on a supervisory basis or to deny the appeal immediately. But even if the file is summoned from far Kamchatka or burning Tajikistan, does this mean it will be fully and comprehensively reviewed? It does not. I dare to say that the example cited at the beginning of these notes is typical. The petitioner usually receives a terse answer: "Your appeal has been reviewed and denied. Submission of a protest is denied. The sentence is lawful and sound."

This rejection gives rise to new appeals to various instances and the bureaucratic carousel, driven by this invisible coil spring, begins to move. The files thicken with dozens, and sometimes even hundreds, of appeals made at similar reception hours and sent by mail. It is terribly hard to break this vicious circle.

I will refer once again to my own experience. Many times I have participated in cases in which 10-15 negative answers were received from officials of the most varied ranks before they were correctly decided. As a result, it was many months, and sometimes years, before unlawful sentences were reversed or properly modified.

Just recently I submitted three appeals in different cases to the same high supervisory instance at personal reception hours. This was by no means my first time there, and it seemed to me that all the appeals were adequately founded, in fact all three files were demanded for review. But several months later negative answers were received on all three appeals, I had to write to the courts that their lawyer had exhausted all possibilities and I considered my work finished.

Nonetheless, I decided not to give up. With the cooperation of the official who signed the denials, it was decided to conduct a small experiment. At the next reception day I came to him with an unusual request, that he demand all three files again, assign a consultant to study them and report his findings in my presence. In other words, in the presence of a kind of adversary. The effect exceeded my expectations: all three appeals were acknowledged to be sound, protests were lodged on all three appeals, and the judicial errors were corrected.

The above makes clear the most important and significant defect of the current procedure for accepting and deciding appeals against court sentences and judgments that have gone into effect. It is that at the crucial moment when the consultant or zonal procurator who has studied the file is reporting the results of his examination to the appropriate official, who will make the final decision, the petitioner with his counter-inferences and arguments is not present in the office. That is, he is completely deprived of the possibility of disputing anything, disagreeing with anything, objecting, and stating his own reasoning and arguments. But it is precisely during the consultant's report, when the responsible official has on his desk not only the consultant's findings but also the voluminous legal file, that it is easy to establish and review the soundness of the appeal submitted and the findings presented by the consultant. And reach a correct decision in full responsibility.

So it seems to me that the idea is clear: the current practice of receiving citizens and lawyers at court-procurator instances produces nothing and should, it seems to me, simply be abolished. All petitions for a personnel reception, with the necessary documents (appeals, copies of court decisions and the like) attached, should either be sent by mail or put in special box in the reception room. The legal files should be demanded for an appropriate review of all these petitions (with the exception, of course, of plainly unfounded ones). And after careful examination of the file the petitioner should be invited to a personal reception, with his lawyer if necessary, where the results of the examination will be reported and the appropriate decision made in his presence, directly from the materials in the file. The only exception would be those citizens whose appeals are already recognized as sound without the reception. Such a system would naturally, make the consultant more accountable for a correct and objective report of the file and force him to examine the soundness of the appeal more thoroughly and carefully.

I anticipate the objection that this procedure for receiving citizens would require a significant increase in the number of employees of the corresponding departments and administrations. That is certainly true. But it should be kept in mind that almost all the reception rooms with their numerous personnel will

be eliminated. The number of so-called repeated appeals to the same instance will be cut sharply because the detailed review of the appeal in the presence of the petitioner, if it does not convince the person who submitted a clearly unsound request, will still take away his desire to repeat a procedure that was fairly unpleasant for him. This will, in turn, reduce the work volume of the apparatus for reviewing repeated appeals.

And in general, is it tolerable to talk about economy when it is a matter of restoring justice, correcting judicial errors, protecting people's destinies?

11176

TuSSR: Doctors Tried for Refusal to Treat Child
18300592a Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 8 Apr 87 p 3

[Article by V. Tsymbal, senior procurator assistant of the Turkmen SSR and justice counselor: "The Physician Turned His Back..."]

[Text] A misfortune in the family of Khodzhamurad Khodzhayev took place unexpectedly. Their little year-old son Atamurad became sick. The child's mother Ogulbek did not sleep a wink all night long. And just as daybreak broke outside the window, she wrapped her son in a blanket and left with her son and husband for Bekil-Bazar.

Finally, they arrived at the rayon central hospital. Khodzhamurad, Ogulbek with the child in her hands went in to see Bayram Orazov, head of the hospital's infectious diseases department. As they walked into his office, he put down the telephone and glanced at them.

"What is the matter with your child?" asked the physician.

The Khodzhayevs vied with each other in telling the physician when their child became ill and how the illness proceeded. Then B. Orazov examined little Atamurad.

"The child's condition is serious," he reported. "It could only be meningitis. You will have to take him to the Mary Oblast Children's Hospital."

"Then, could you call the hospital or give us an admissions certificate?" asked the Khodzhayevs. Oh yes, and could you give some kind of medicine. After all, the child is getting worse with each passing hour."

"They will admit him without a certificate," Orazov assured the parents. "Just go there now," and he turned away.

And so the Khodzhayevs got a ride in a passing car to Mary. Acting chief of the Infectious Diseases Department of the Oblast Children's Hospital Cherkez Khodzhageldyyev confirmed the child's critical condition after having examined him. His diagnosis: an intestinal infection of unknown etiology. "And the child will have to be treated at the oblast infectious diseases hospital," Ch. Khodzhageldyyev concluded. "Go there."

"How much do we have to travel around?" the perturbed Khodzhayev asked. "We have been taking the child from one hospital to another and no one has given us any help."

"I know better where and what kind of treatment is available," answered Ch. Khodzhageldyyev. "Here is an admissions certificate and go there."

The duty physician at the oblast infectious diseases hospital, T. I. Gazarova, was not at her station. The parents waited for about another half hour. Then they started to look for anyone from the medical personnel. In the courtyard they came upon the physician K. Orazkuliyeu who agreed to examine the child.

"The child's condition is extremely critical," he concluded. He added his own diagnosis the previous ones: acute influenza. "The child requires immediate hospitalization and treatment."

"Well then, it all seems clear now," thought Ogulbek. "They will put the child into a hospital and he will be treated." But that was not to be the case at that hospital.

"I cannot admit your child into the hospital," declared K. Orazkuliyeu to the Khodzhayevs. We have to have instructions from a departmental chief of our hospital in order to have the child sent to the oblast children's hospital."

"What are we to do?" asked the dismayed parents.

"Take him to the children's oblast hospital or to the Bekil-Bazar central rayon hospital. In order to bring him here, I repeat, you will have to get instructions from the chief physician or a departmental chief."

The chief of the pediatric department was not in his office. Chief of the Adult Department A. Yagshiyev did not give any instructions for the child to be hospitalized. "The Bekil-Bazar rayon hospital has its own infectious disease department, you should go there," was the response.

When the Khodzhayevs returned to the oblast children's hospital with their son, Ch. Khodzhageldyyev categorically refused to have their child hospitalized. "This question can only be resolved by the chief physician or his deputy, but neither of them is in the hospital."

During the second half of the day, the parents who were now exhausted from their ordeal returned with their sick child to Bekil-Bazar.

"Let's go again to the infectious diseases hospital," said Khodzhayev to his wife.

Department Chief B. Orazov again examined Atamurad and once again confirmed that the child's condition was extremely critical.

"But we can't treat him here because we only treat children who are two years of age or older, and your child is just a little over one year. Take him to the central rayon hospital or the resuscitation department of the oblast hospital."

When the child was brought to the Bekil-Bazar Central Rayon Hospital he was already in the agony state. There, one more diagnosis was made: The child had an acute respiratory viral infection — neurotoxicosis. But it didn't make any difference any longer. The child died a few hours later...

An administrative inquiry and subsequent criminal investigation of the case conclusively found that B. Orazov, Ch. Khodzhageldyyev, K. Orazkuliyeu, and the others to whom the Khodzhayevs turned for help were authorized and obligated to render medical assistance to the ailing child.

It is difficult to say whether or not the child's life could have been saved if the physicians had made the proper diagnosis and rendered timely assistance. Unfortunately, that is not always possible. But what is frightful is the indifference shown by medical personnel, their neglect of their duty and obligation, and their obliviousness towards the Hippocratic oath which each of them took upon obtaining their medical degree. There can be no dilemma for the person in the white gown as to whether he wishes or does not wish to treat a patient or whether the treatment is pleasant or unpleasant, or whether it will be beneficial or not. Once you have become a medical person, you are obliged to help others wherever medical assistance might be needed, be it on the road, the street, in a public place, or at home.

B. Orazov, Ch. Khodzhageldyyev, and K. Orazkuliyeu were held legally responsible for failing to render assistance to a sick child without good reason which resulted in the child's death. The People's Court of the city of Mary sentenced them to various terms of corrective labor with 20 percent of their wages to be turned over to the state. The court considered the possibility of placing them on probation at the collectives in which they had been working.

I would like to believe that the events that took place will serve as a stern lesson both to the convicted persons themselves as well as to the collectives of the

Bekil-Bazar Central Rayon Hospital, the Mary Oblast children's and infectious diseases hospitals and to all those who have chosen to undertake the difficult but noble work of a physician.

6289

**UkSSR: Komsomol Antinarcotics Program
Improvements Reviewed**

18300592b Kiev *RABOCHAYA GAZETA* in Russian
30 May 87 p 2

[Unsigned article: "In Spite of Narcotics"]

[Text] The struggle against drug addiction was the subject of the articles "Poppy Grief" and "Sharp Needle Poison" that were published in *Rabochaya Gazeta* on October 12 and December 20 of last year as well as the subject of a collection of readers' letters published in the paper's November 25 edition of that year. The editors received several official responses to those articles and letters.

Secretary of the Odessa gorkom of the Ukrainian Komsomol, Comrade Yesipov, responded that "the criticisms about the Komsomol committees' work on the problem of drug addiction as noted in the article 'Poppy Grief' are quite proper and timely. The substance of the article was discussed at a meeting of the Odessa Komsomol raykom secretaries, the supervisors of the special subdivisions of operative Komsomol peoples' patrol [druzhinniki] detachments in concert with Internal Affairs Administration officials of the Odessa oblispolkom, and the oblast narcology office."

Secretary of the Slavyanskiy gorkom of the Ukrainian CP V. Sbitnev wrote that the article "Sharp Needle Poison" was discussed at the buro of the party gorkom. Penalties for negligence in the control of drug addiction among students have been assessed against CPSU member T. I. Dolinin, deputy director for training and education at the Construction Industry Technical School No 56 where the coed T. G. died from an injection of narcotics, and against A. A. Miroshnichenko, director of the Construction Industry Technical School No 57 where two of the persons convicted in the case were students.

Comrade Sbitnev wrote further that "the party gorkom buro has obligated the ispolkom of the city soviet of people's deputies and Deputy Chairman Comrade Zemlyak personally to undertake the necessary measures to create the material base required for working with the public at their residences. The substance of the article was also discussed with the party-management aktiv of the city and at open party meetings at teaching institutions, therapeutic institutions, the militia, the court, and at the procurator's office. Discussions of the article were also organized at labor collectives of the city and at parent meetings.

The Komsomol gorkom is restructuring its operations with juveniles and young people and the composition of the operative Komsomol detachments has been strengthened."

The articles "Poppy Grief" and "Sharp Needle Poison" were also reviewed at the UkSSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education. Chairman of the State Committee comrade Kadatskiy said in his response that "the problems raised in the articles are indeed urgent ones and the criticism is justified. The collegium of the State Committee has examined the question of intensifying the struggle against drug addiction among students. Permanently operating seminars on anti-alcohol and anti-narcotic propaganda have been organized for the deputy directors of the schools. Periodic medical examinations of juveniles are conducted at the teaching institutions and a list is kept of persons who are inclined to use narcotics. Drug inspections stations are also being created. Methodical recommendations for the prevention of drug addiction have been prepared and sent out to all teaching institutions. One million copies of such recommendations and reminders as 'Drug Addiction — A Most Dangerous Ailment' have been prepared for publication."

The response to the editors signed by collegium member of the UkSSR Ministry of Health and Chief of the Main Administration for Vocational Therapeutic Assistance comrade Kozlyuk declared that "the tragic case described in the article has become a special topic of discussion for physicians of the Donetsk Oblast." The republic's health authorities and institutions have intensified their activity to prevent drug addiction. Inspections have identified youngsters aged 15 to 17 years who have been abusing narcotics. The number of such youngsters has doubled over that of 1985. An organizational-methodological center for drug addiction has been created on a republic-wide scale at the Kharkov Scientific-Research Institute of Neurology and Psychiatry in order to coordinate anti-narcotic efforts."

A response was also received from the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee. The Central Committee Secretary V. Miroshnichenko wrote:

"It is a fact that the anti-narcotic efforts undertaken by the Slavyanskiy city Komsomol organizations of the Donetsk Oblast have not been satisfactory... Training of the city's Komsomol aktiv has been organized which included the participation of law enforcement and medical institution officials. However, the necessary results in this matter have not yet been obtained. The Komsomol organizations have not properly approached Komsomol members who have been listed by militia or health authorities as narcotics abusers... The operative Komsomol peoples' patrol [druzhinniki] detachment is still not very

effective. There must be an improvement in individual work with persons who are abusing narcotics. The Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee has rendered assistance to the Slavyanskiy Komsomol gorkom in this matter.

The Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee considers anti-narcotics work among the youth to be one of its most important tasks. The status of these efforts and the

progress being made in carrying out the slated measures to eradicate drug addiction are regularly reviewed at sessions of the buro and secretariat.

Officials of the Ukrainian Komsomol Central Committee have rendered assistance to the Komsomol committees of the Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, Nikolayev, Odessa, Crimean, and Khmelnytskyi oblasts.

6289

Major Environmental Problems in Moldavia Described

18000803 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian 29 Jul 87 p 12

[Article by the writer Ion Drutse, under the rubric "Writer and Society": "Green Leaf, Water, and Punctuation Marks"]

[Text] The article by LG's special correspondent K. Kozhevnikova, who has written more than once about the problems of the economics of Moldavia's agriculture, had already been set for the issue when Ion Drutse, the well-known Moldavian writer, brought his article to the editors and requested that it be published as soon as possible. We decided to print both articles at the same time, recognizing that such a publication is to some extent unusual. But after all, the reasons that prompted the editors are also unusual: the topics are too important.

And so, two points of view—that of a writer and that of a journalist—on one problem: Moldavia in the mirror of restructuring.

1. Let us begin, it goes without saying, with the earth. Still, over his long history man has not had a more faithful ally, protector and friend than his earth. A sense of filial devotion to Mother Earth came to be transmitted genetically from generation to generation. And what words did our ancestors not find to glorify her! For them she was eternal, holy, kindred and a provider. How much labor and hopes went into every furrow, into every little ear of grain; how many people fell defending these lands; how many lumps were taken away with people to warm their hearts when they moved to foreign lands!

On the earth, imbibing its meaning and beauty, our successors are brought up, and their tastes and ideals are formed. The earth also indisputably leaves its imprint on the character of the people that inhabits it. The breadth of the Volga, the severity of the Caucasus Mountains, the boundlessness of the Ukrainian steppes, the dense verdure of the Baltic region, and the gentle hills of Moldavia—all this can be easily found in folklore, the patterns of speech, the very world view of the peoples who inhabit these regions.

Either by dint of their extreme emotionality or for some other reasons, Moldavians have taken love for their native land to the upper limit. The very sign of the nature's activity, the "frunze verde," the green leaf, has become a refrain in almost all our folk songs. Moreover, the word "frunze" designates whole constellations of concepts, the state of material and nonmaterial things, villages, and native boughs, and every time I hear the word of the announcer in the Moscow subway announcing, "the next station is the Frunze," I briefly see before me the happy faces of Moldavians who have seen green leaves, the first signs of spring, after the long winter cold.

But let us not go on at special length about our own small homeland, especially since love is one of the most intimate manifestations of the human spirit. Let us only note that our little homeland is not just the eternal fellow traveler of our life. It is the bulwark of our spirit, the meaning of our labors, and the main arbiter of our destiny.

Quitting my little homeland at the age of almost 20, having had time to work, suffer and stand on my own feet there, I left behind my favorite, cherished little spots, which from time to time I visit. We all have our cherished spots in our native region. Rivers and streams, river banks, ravines, copses, glades, gates, lone trees, and roads and paths that are completely unremarkable to an outsider's eye. There, in those secret spots, the soul must store its inviolable reserves; it is there that our conscience and our honor lie; and for this reason, we must tremble every time we get news from there.

However, we change, and our cherished little spots also change. The drama and complexity of the present-day world penetrate even to the most hidden and intimate aspects of our existence. There was a time when my favorite little spots did not want to know me any longer; and there was a time when when I, as the saying goes, wouldn't lay eyes on them. Then, as happens, we were reconciled, and once again everything seemingly started to go as it had of old, except—. For some time, some sort of misfortune had come to hover over those spots that are dear to my heart. Even though they had been cared for beyond belief, even though they had produced record crop yields, even though they had been decked with awards—some sort of doom hovered over them.

2. One of Moldavia's most ancient disasters is a chronic shortage of water. How many times, wasted by drought, this land of ours died before our ancestors' eyes, and how many of our ancestors died along with it! At the end of the 18th century, during the second Russo-Turkic War, Rymyantsev-Zadunayskiy's army of 40,000, caught by heat and drought on the Kubolt, drained that little river in two days and was forced to pay a ruble in gold for every little cask of Dniestr water that our ancestors hauled on their scrawny horses over more than 40 versts. In the last century, when reserves of fresh water did not particularly interest anyone, all the geographical reference books noted that the Bessarabia Guberniya held last place in Europe in terms of water reserves. Our chronicles and legends are full of tales of droughts, of which the last, postwar drought of 1947-1947 was one of the most terrible and devastating.

Subject to droughts, Moldavia, moreover, has absolutely no water reserves. Three relatively small tributaries of the Dniestr—the Reut, the Kubolt and the Keynar—almost completely dry up during the heat of summer. And our main rivers, the Dniestr and the Prut, which are fed by the Carpathian snows, also run half dry by midsummer.

There is only one thing left to do—to take a shovel and go dig in hopes of finding that full-flowing spring that everyone dreams of. Who hasn't tried his luck in our arid hills! With what adornments people still deck their wells! What legends surround the work of well-diggers in Moldavia!

In the past half-century almost everyone from my family has left my native village of Khorodishty. Both near and remote kin have left. Neither my father's home, nor the giant chestnut tree that once stood beautifully by our gate is there any longer, and only in the field, not far from the Kubolt, can one find the lone white stone that once covered a well dug by my father. And although the well itself and its water no longer exist, the spot itself, and maybe that stone are still called "Penteley's well" in the oral speech of the villagers.

And there is nothing surprising about the fact that in Moldavian villages, wells and the places adjoining them are among the most joyous and honored places. It is there that housewives hastily exchange news in the mornings. Over the course of the day children keep running to the well: there with an empty bucket and back with a full one, for that is one of the first errands that Moldavians assign to their offspring. In the evenings the men, the heads of families, gather at the well, for it has been noted that alongside a well, accompanied by the even dripping of water, voices sound somehow fuller, and ripe and glorious thoughts come to mind, and that may be why what Moldavians decide "at the well" becomes an unshakeable, almost sacred matter.

3. Having spoken about the land and water, it is time to talk about a sense of measure and about that strange, mysterious correlation among everything on which, I think, the world rests. Losing our sense of measure, we usually lose everything. For long centuries Moldavia's ecological balance, put together bit by bit by our ancestors, was held by a thread, and one ill-considered decision was enough to—

But, my God, how merciless destiny has been toward my little homeland! It does not want, at any cost, to allow it the golden mean. Either first or last. Either on the top line, or on the bottom. Practically in first place in Europe in population density—125 people per square kilometer. And last, one can say, in water reserves. Once again, until recently—first in the Union in terms of the concentration of unsupervised power in a single pair of hands. And last in what has now come to be called openness.

It is hard to write about this, but the time has come to call things by their proper names. It is a secret to no one that what is customarily called the "stagnation of the '60s" (one must assume that a more exact term that accords with the essence of the phenomenon will eventually be found), that infamous stagnation, spread its wings and took off in flight from the Moldavian hills. Fertile lands, Moldavians' uncomplaining nature and

the abundance of good wine seemingly disposed inordinate ambitions to exceed the bounds of common sense and create something that would stun the country, and maybe the world.

Creation led to chaos, and nervous chaos is a natural environment for petty tyrants. The people's traditions and moral foundations were the first to be sacrificed as impediments to progress. The petty tyrant needs for absolutely everything to have begun with himself. Until his time there was a wasteland; he came, and life began. The second blow was taken by the Moldavian intelligentsia, which reacts sensitively to all fluctuations in traditions and morality. Labels were instantaneously produced that had to be worn for decades. How many radiant initiatives, which we so desperately need today, were destroyed in embryo; how many crippled lives there were; how many had to be buried.

Moldavia, which had seen a lot in its time, looked on with sad eyes at the raging of destruction under the banner of creation, and those sad, all-understanding eyes started to irritate the great experimenters. It was decided to shake up the republic itself, since it had a different view of the world, and my God, how many times the republic map was carved and recarved! In the memory of a single generation, villages went back and forth five or six times from one rayon to another.

It was decided to raise the question of water resources to an unprecedented height. Gigantic plans were drawn up, and while those great plans were being examined by various offices, orders were given to create huge reservoirs in place of small ponds. The flow of small rivers was overregulated, and they were destroyed; the great reservoirs evaporated and turned to swamps. But the idea of a Danube-Dniestr-Dniepr canal failed to receive support at the top level, and Moldavia remains without even that small bit of water that it had stored up.

It was fine for the Danube and the Dniepr, which are beyond the reach of the Kishinev rulers, but the poor Dniestr took a beating. Efforts were hastily undertaken to build the Dubossarry Hydroelectric Station. The hydroelectric station's economic effect is insignificant in comparison to the woes that it is now causing. Waterless Kishinev is itself supplied with Dniestr water, and by interrupting the rhythm of the low river's flow, the great power engineers endangered the whole capital's water supply.

The shortage of fresh water also started to affect the residents of Odessa. "Oh, so that's what you're doing," the people may have said in some department or other. And they created their own reservoir on the Dniestr's upper reaches, drawing off a hefty share of Dniestr water. If one adds to that the disaster that occurred several years ago—the bursting of the dam holding in saline waste in the Western Ukraine—which killed almost every living thing, and if one considers the fact that before the river had really had a chance to be restored to

life, a metallurgical combine was hastily put up in Rybnitsa, on its banks, there is nothing surprising about the fact that the Dniestr has now been fated to be one of the most polluted and doomed rivers.

With the problem of water supply "solved" in this way, fruit growing was the next undertaking. All the old orchards were dug up, and several giants were started: one of them, the flagship of Moldavian fruit growing, a real beauty, covered thousands of hectares! It was distressing, to be sure, that one couldn't take the giant in with one's eye, and if such a marvel cannot be shown to foreign guests, what's the use of it?

A solution was found. It was decided to show the orchard from helicopter and to take the fruit itself, for the sake of convenience, along in the cabin. And for many years countless delegations, crunching juicy apples, admired the gigantic panorama. Legends about this orchard spread around the world, and it hardly occurred to anyone that the orchard was a monument to petty tyranny. In the spring there are not enough bees to pollenate it, and hundreds of hectares remain barren, without harvest. In order to even out the situation, the giant marvel's bosses travel around to the farms in the southern Ukraine and Moldavia every spring trying to persuade the beekeepers to help them. Transportation is provided and, moreover, 15 rubles a hive is paid, but the beekeepers are in no hurry, and they have their own reasons for this.

The creation of a glittering republic in the South was in full swing. Granted, there was interference from the skeptical looks of the majority and that folk common sense that duly appraises everything. It was necessary somehow to get rid of those sarcastic looks, and so the southern eagles got the idea of putting the very producers of material goods outside the game, of tactfully crowding the worker off that very land on which he was standing with both feet.

Today we must bitterly admit that this monstrous plan partly succeeded. At first the planning organizations took upon themselves the strategic side of the business—what, where, when and how to plant. With the establishment of the large interkolkhoz maintenance and repair stations, the plowing, planting and harvesting also became the business of the central authorities. The Council for Kolkhoz Affairs gathered all the economic resources into its pocket. Only the cultivation of the fields still remained in the hands of the kolkhoz members themselves. For a certain time weeds served as a kind of guarantee of democracy—as long as the weeds grew in the fields, it was necessary to reckon with the majority will.

Agrochemistry became a manna from heaven for the Kishinev experimenters. A mysterious dust spread by airplanes destroyed the weeds without touching the crops. But what was most important was that these chemicals untied their hands and allowed them no longer

to reckon with anyone. Agrochemistry indirectly breathed a new life into the most fantastic plans, and the southern eagles, before the eyes of an astonished world, finally took flight from the Moldavian hills. The toilers of the fields were left, so to speak, holding the bag.

For a quarter of a century chemical storms have blown over Moldavia's fields. From morning to evening almost all year round airplanes with pesticides circle through the air. What doesn't go into a plane is mixed in with seeds, put on as top dressing, or dissolved in water and sprayed over vast areas. And one can often even see an old woman walking around her private plot carrying a bucket and besom, sprinkling for all she is worth on it, so that it too can be clear, like the other.

The emergency concentration of effort has become a norm for the Moldavian land. The republic's economic situation seems anomalous to me. With a budget of 2.7 billion rubles, Moldavia's aggregate social product reaches 18 billion. May the central planning authorities permit me to doubt the wisdom of such a situation. Today the thriving agrochemist thinks only about how to provide more. The intelligent person reflects on what he is providing today, and what will remain for tomorrow. The wise person, however, thinks not only about today and tomorrow, but about the day after tomorrow, as well, for our children will have to live and work on this land, and they are still not strangers to us.

Alas, all these are empty dreams, because our pride and our glory, our earth the provider is still a hostage in the hands of absolutely irresponsible people. Sprinkle as many pesticides as you like, just so you harvest more and report as fast as possible to your superiors the joyous news about fulfilling and overfulfilling the plan, just so you move at least a little bit higher up the career ladder. And the fact that in time people start to return from various locations produce that is unfit for consumption as food, well that will happen in what will already be a different quarter, and the scandal will be raised in different departments.

In the final analysis, the use of chemical herbicides and pesticides in Moldavia has gotten out of control. Kolkhozes have been given complete freedom to spread them at will. And they spread them—on the average, 22.5 kg per hectare, which is 10 times or more the average for the country as a whole. When the summer is dry, the winds strip these chemicals off the fields along with the dust and carry them to villages, orchards and people's faces. When rain is plentiful, flows of water wash the chemical herbicides and pesticides off the fields and fill our valleys with them, leaving the livestock without pasture. Today almost all the valleys between the hills are dead zones for vegetation.

The most terrible thing, however, is good weather, with heat and moderate rain, when the chemicals go where they are supposed to and do their dirty deeds. This is because, as one can easily guess, they do not remain on

the weeds. Assimilated with nutrients, the chemicals penetrate to the ears of grain, the berries and the vegetables. Nitrates, the most destructive part of these chemical herbicides and pesticides, are especially dangerous. After entering the human organism and being converted to nitrites, they first of all attack the immune system and the reproductive apparatus. And this affects our heirs.

4. A special word must be said about our children, for it is precisely our children who have taken the main blow of the chemicalization of agriculture. It is no secret to anyone that since the enthusiasm for these pesticides in Moldavia, mentally retarded children have started to be born. Today there are about 50 schools for sick children in Moldavia. But they cover only part of them. Many parents do not want to part with their grief, and thus in almost every Moldavian village, every school and every record book for every class, following the list of students there are three or four blank lines, after which there are another five or six names without a single grade after them.

For a long time it was believed that the blame for everything lay with alcohol, but scientists from the Moldavian Institute of Health and Epidemiology reached the conclusion that, whereas it is possible to attribute some of the cases to alcohol abuse, the rest are indisputably the result of intensive chemicalization.

Moldavia's second woe after chemicalization is the growing of tobacco beyond all sensible limits. Just think: the area of tobacco plantings approaches the area of our vineyards and our orchards, and some wit has already asked whether we shouldn't incorporate a smoking cigar in the republic seal along with ears of grain and bunches of grapes. It is said that some members of the republic's leadership insist on growing tobacco, for tobacco provides hard currency. There's no disputing that hard currency is a good thing, but not at any price! For who doesn't know that a large part of the labor on tobacco fields falls the lot of children. And although the use of child labor in growing tobacco is strictly forbidden by law, it doesn't take the nose of Sherlock Holmes to find in every little village and at every step, little girls and boys with teary eyes sweating over bunches of tobacco. Nearby, a little farther off, educators stand in confusion, and it has never been heard of that even one school director received even an oral reprimand for the fact that he had cast his charges into this infernal sea of nicotine.

Another trial for Moldavian young people is the harvesting of vegetables and fruits. This labor-intensive process falls almost fully on the fragile shoulders of schoolchildren and higher-school students. Over the summer, before turning red and filling with juice, these apples, pears and grapes, as we already know, are repeatedly treated with various chemicals, and the young people—what about them! The work a little while, fool around a little while, laugh a little and pop an apple or two in their mouths. And Moldavia, as we know, suffers from a

chronic water shortage. There in the fields there is nothing with which to wet one's throat, much less something to wash fruit with. And so it goes from year to year: an army of schoolchildren and students occupies our hills, face to face with this monstrous poison.

5. Having spoken about the land, the water and that critical situation in which they find themselves, it is time to move on to commas. Moldavian writers were the first to raise the alarm. Something wrong had started to happen to their native speech. In place of a beautiful, singing language mixed with ancient Latin, there was some sort of gray flow of sounds, a jumble of words that, so to speak, were neither here nor there. All these pretentious bunch of sounds not only violated the aesthetic principles of the language but forced the people who were speaking themselves into an impasse, for it was often hard to said who wanted to say what.

Specialists were assigned the task of studying the essence of the problem and presenting officials with recommendations. After long and painstaking research, philologists reached the conclusion that the whole problem was commas. Some strange things had started to happen with commas among Moldavians. Suddenly at some point the whole people had seemingly forgotten how to use them. Either people would ignore them, forcing their speech into a single flow, or they would place a comma after every word, which again made no sense.

These debates about commas would have undoubtedly raged on even longer if biologists and medical scientists had not come to the aid of their philologist colleagues. And so, at first quietly and timidly, and then more and more loudly, questions of language started to be linked with people's health.

Do you think that this aroused an extremely powerful disturbance in any echelons of the republic authorities? Do you think that measures were promptly developed for the strictest regulation of chemical herbicides and pesticides? You do not know my countrymen very well. A decree was adopted calling for the utmost improvement of the teaching and studying of the Moldavian language: it contains, among others, a point calling for the improvement of the oratorical art in Moldavian!

6. But have you noted, dear reader, a striking parallel, an unavoidable duality in our life? Somehow it turns out that words for us are on one shore, while deeds are on the other, and they by no means always meet. As a result, we speak repeatedly words day and night about the rational operation of the economy, but our hands continue to do the irrational. We count our potential profits in rubles, in the millions, while at the same time that which is priceless, which has been given to us by destiny and nature, is thrown to the wind. We rise to the defense of openness and restructuring, and in the meanwhile we

appoint to key positions people for whom openness and restructuring are like a sharp knife. We swear by the good and dream of happiness and beauty, but in the meanwhile—

To put it more briefly, in terms of the poisoning of the soil with chemical herbicides and pesticides, Moldavia today holds one of the leading places in the country. Disturbance of the ecological balance has resulted in the destruction of beekeeping, upset the migration of migratory birds, and placed the life of our forests in danger.

Nonetheless, it is an amazing country. Vast expanses, thousands upon thousands of kilometers of borders, sensitive radars guarding the inviolability of our land day and night, while at the same time squadrons of agricultural planes rise in the air day and night and spread thousands of tons of chemical herbicides and pesticides, destroying life on that same land that our border troops are so zealously and vigilantly guarding. Is it possible that a great civilized country can act this way? Is it possible to promulgate thousands of laws and decrees and not have fundamental laws protecting our land, water and air? Is it permissible to maintain such a huge army of law-enforcement agencies that is incapable of protecting our heirs and our future from our own barbarism? To have thousands of organizations and not a single agency to protect the stock of what I would say is the sacred biological fermentation that gives rise to individuals and the creative energy of the people, and on which everything rests?

7. It would be unfair to claim that nothing at all has changed for the better in recent years in Moldavia. But the obstruction was so great that, may my fellow countrymen forgive me, it seems to me that their efforts to overcome the stagnation have been purely symbolic in nature. The period of wild debauchery, admixed with intoxication and thievery, holds numerous secret and open supporters on call.

Openness and restructuring still find themselves lonely and defenseless here. The slightest critical observation throws everyone into a fury. And at the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee's last plenum an attempt was even made to resurrect the ill-famed experience of Voroshilovgrad—it was proposed that criminal charges be brought against the authors of rather harmless but critical articles. And the fact that the chemicalization of Moldavia's agriculture, under conditions of a chronic water shortage and high population density, is most likely a real criminal matter—for some reason that is not talked about.

But what do people talk about in Moldavia? I look in the columns of *Sovetskaya Moldaviya*—the materials of the last plenum of the republic Communist Party Central Committee. All the speeches are sustained in a major key, all instill an elevated optimism and sense of the coming celebration, and there is only one isolated and

lonely cloud on this whole blue firmament—the Moldavian Writers' Union and its newspaper *Literatura Shi Artia*. They have been attacked by A. Zhuchenko, president of the republic Academy of Sciences, who, it seems, has not once crossed the threshold of our Writers' Union and has no idea of what people there are disturbed about.

By chance issues of *Sovetskaya Moldaviya* encountered, on my desk, the issue of *Pravda* containing M. S. Gorbachev's speech to writers and representatives of the mass information media. What tactfulness, confidence and respect! I understand that Kishinev is not Moscow, and that they are separated by about 1,500 km, but not by millions, not by billions!

"Nonetheless, under the present distribution of duties, who answers for protection of the genetic stock and, in the broader understanding, the biological stock? The State Bank, the militia, public health officials?"

"In principle, the republic Academy of Sciences should answer for this, but it is impossible to rely on its objectivity. The academy's executives and, above all, its President A. Zhuchenko are the main strategists of the dehydration and chemicalization of the soil."

"And you sit with hands folded watching Zhuchenko carry out his tragic experiments?"

"Where did you get the idea that we were sitting with hands folded? We are taking action. Shortly the republic Supreme Soviet will examine a law on protection of the environment until the year 2000 and beyond."

Words, words, words! And in the meanwhile, not far from the capital bulldozers are preparing to dig up the depths with a thunder, clearing a place for the foundation of a new construction project. A complex for the production of—what do you think? Pesticides.

8756

Concerns Over New Railroad Construction in Georgia Addressed

18300616 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
29 May 87 pp 1-2

[GRUZINFORM report: "KPZhD: Past and Future Responsibility"]

[Text] From a joint expanded meeting of the Georgian CP Central Committee Buro and the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium.

Those problems associated with carrying out the resolutions of the managing organs on the construction of the Caucasus Mountain (Pass) Railroad, problems which touch upon certain economic, demographic, ecological, archaeological and other aspects, were discussed during a joint expanded session of the Georgian CP Central Committee Buro and the Presidium of the Council of

Ministers of the Georgian SSR. The following participated in the work of this session: party, soviet, trade union and komsomol workers, heads of ministries and departments, representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentsia and the mass media, planners and builders. The chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR, O.Ye. Cherkezova, furnished information on the course of an additional study of all aspects of the construction of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad by a committee of the republic's Council of Ministers, formed in conformity with an assignment handed down during the 6th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia.

The following individuals participated in the discussion: chairman of Gosstroy for the Georgian SSR G.Z. Minashvili, director of the Kavgioprotrans Institute L.I. Kvartskhava, director of the Scientific Research Institute of Economics and National Economic Planning and Administration of the republic's Gosplan K.N. Charkviani, chairman of the State Committee for Labor of the Georgian SSR R.A. Dzhabladze, chairman of the State Committee for the Protection of Nature of the Georgian SSR V.Ya. Kacharava, chief of the Main Scientific-Production Administration for the Protection and Use of Historical, Cultural and Natural Memorials of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR I.N. Tsitsishvili, academician-secretaries of the Georgian Academy of Sciences A.M. Apakidze and E.A. Sekhniashvili, Minister of the Forestry Industry for the Georgian SSR Sh.I. Chalaganidze, 1st secretary of the Dushetskiy Rayon Party Committee N.A. Odishvili, chairman of the State Committee for Science and Engineering of the Georgian SSR I.S. Zhordanaya, chief of the Board of Directors for the Construction of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad G.D. Bapanchivadze, chief of the republic's Administration for Hydrometeorology and Control Over the Natural Environment M.M. Ardiya, rector of the Georgian Polytechnical Institute imeni V.I. Lenin, Academician of the republic's Academy of Sciences T.N. Lopadze, director of the Botanical Institute of the Georgian Academy of Sciences and Corresponding Member of the republic's Academy of Sciences G.Sh. Nakhutsrishvili, chairman of the Union of Theatrical Figures of Georgia G.D. Lordkipanidze, rector of Tbilisi State University and Corresponding Member of the Georgian Academy of Sciences N.S. Amaglobeli, deputy director of the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography imeni I.A. Dzhevakhishvili, director of the Center for Archaeological Studies O.D. Lordkipanidze, director of the Institute of Mining Mechanics of the Georgian Academy of Sciences and Academician of the republic's Academy of Sciences A.A. Dzidzigiuri, chief engineer for the Caucasus Mountain Railroad project N.B. Svanishvili, poet-academician I.V. Abashidze and chief of the Kavkaztonnelstroy Construction Administration A.I. Chaladze.

Speeches were delivered during the meeting by comrades V.I. Alavidze, O.G. Vardzelashvili, P.G. Gilashvili, G.N. Yenukidze, G.D. Mgeladze, B.V. Nikolskiy, N.A. Chitanaya, D.V. Margvelidze, N.R. Sadzhaya and V.M. Siradze.

The results of the meeting were summarized by the 1st secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia D.I. Patiashvili.

History of the Problem

This idea has boggled the mind for more than a century. Thirty years ago it began to assume the true features of a project. Finally, this is now the third year since its practical realization was started. The implementation of the project for building the Caucasus Crossing Railroad embodies truly revolutionary changes in both the economic and social spheres. This then explains the high degree of responsibility being displayed towards this problem throughout the republic by all organs, institutes and organizations associated with the building of the trunk line of the century. Today man can no longer live in the absence of technical progress and he must constantly learn to visualize and to overcome the definite difficulties which are inevitably associated with it.

It was from this standpoint that the discussion commenced in the vestibule of the meeting hall of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia, where models, schematics and diagrams had been set up for the purpose of illustrating the solutions for many problems associated with building the trunk line and the tasks for the socio-economic development of its surrounding regions. But every theme invariably returned to the history of the problem.

As is known, the recent 6th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia handed down an assignment calling for the creation of an all-round committee of the republic's Council of Ministers for examining those questions associated with the construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad. This was undertaken owing to the fact that some representatives of the community, when referring to the possible ecological, demographic and historical-cultural consequences, expressed doubts as to the advisability of building the trunk line. It was reported during the meeting that the technical justification for building the Caucasus Mountain Railroad had once again been examined and that a committee of the republic's Council of Ministers had created working groups for carrying out an additional study of its economic, ecological, demographic and archaeological aspects and also those aspects associated with the protection of cultural memorials. It was mentioned that in both the republic and the government of the USSR, all of these aspects had at one time been examined thoroughly in state or scientific institutes. But since questions had nonetheless arisen, the working groups to which the eminent scientists and specialists were assigned were once again tasked with ensuring that no mistakes were tolerated during this particular stage.

As yet, not all of the groups have provided their final conclusions. Some have requested that they be granted more time for more thorough study and documentation and for carrying out additional computations. But a

unanimous opinion is already being expressed at the present time which holds that no mistakes were tolerated during the stage devoted to developing the technical-economic justification. No serious complications were anticipated for any of the questions which arose. The work of the groups is continuing and all of these conclusions will be studied attentively and taken into consideration when developing the technical plan for the Caucasus Mountain Railroad and the working drawings for its construction.

With regard to the second stage of the work — the development of the technical plan — here there was unanimous opinion among those participating in the meeting concerning the need for close collaboration between all of the scientific institutes and the planners, in the interest of ensuring timely and mutually acceptable solutions for the problems that arise. This applies to archaeological studies, the protection of nature and other questions. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the normative documents and contractual and legal documents that have been adopted at the present time are ensuring the required degree of security for carrying out all of the work planned. A chief concern — they must be carried out in a strict manner by all parties involved, especially by the builders.

Preparatory construction work is underway at the present time at the Arkhotskiy Pass. A technical plan has been prepared for installing here a unique tunnel 23 kilometers in length. The plans for other installations are still in the developmental stage. They must be presented to the builders as early as possible so that they will be able to prepare for and think out the tactics to be employed, since the conditions are truly exceptional both from the standpoint of the front of work to be completed and the possible consequences to production operations in this region. The natural qualities of the mountains must be retained, the daily routine for the miners must be organized and there must be no disruption in the existing structure for their resettlement and tenor of life.

This constitutes the chief concern of the collective of the Kavgioprotrans Planning-Research Institute — the leading institute in the Trans-Caucasus republics, the north Caucasus, Krasnodar Kray and Rostov Oblast for planning the projects of transport construction. Never before was a plan developed at this institute in such a thorough and careful manner, nor discussed by the specialists in such a detailed and comprehensive manner as the Caucasus Mountain Railroad project.

Certainly, the planners recognized that it would be dishonest on their part to promise that not one tree would be cut down or one slope disturbed. This could not be avoided: many complicated engineering installations would have to be located in a narrow gorge. Thus all efforts were directed towards ensuring that the project embodied a technology which conformed strictly to the

norms for protecting nature. In particular, in the beautiful Mukhranskaya Valley, which has long been considered to be one of the principal grain areas of Georgia, the plans called for a single track railway in the interest of limiting the damage to the surrounding environment. In the Barisakho region, the planners and researchers on four occasions laid out a "natural" route, only to return back to the plan on the fifth occasion — for the purpose of undertaking maximum measures aimed at protecting nature and the historical memorials.

This 188 kilometer trunk line, two thirds of which is on Georgian territory, will break many records in terms of the number of engineering installations it includes. Today it is not only the specialists who are aware of the number of tunnels, bridges, viaducts and bulkheads that must be erected and the millions of tons of dirt that must be removed in the process. And the amount of time remaining in which to issue the technical plan for this year continues to decrease. And it was emphasized during the meeting that the considerations and conclusions must be made available to all those who are disturbed over the fate of the trunk line and the regions in which it is located. This is particularly true in view of the fact that the problems associated with this were known long ago and have been examined repeatedly.

A brochure was published in 1976 on the results of a discussion of the technical justification for the road. The discussion took place in the Council for Coordinating the Scientific Activities of VUZ's and the scientific research institutes of the Georgian Academy of Sciences. The brochure was prepared by I.N. Vekua, Ye.K. Khadarze and other eminent scientists of the republic. Thus the entire scientific community is interested in the history of the road — technical, humanitarian and social scientific — and it has participated in this important work. An expanded meeting of this council was held in September of last year and it was attended not only by technical specialists but also by those concerned with history, ethnography, architecture and archaeology. It approved the draft decree of the republic's Council of Ministers concerning measures for the further development of scientific-research work associated with the planning, construction and operation of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad. All unanimously approved the measures indicated for uncovering and studying the memorials of the material and spiritual culture of the people and the development of means for protecting them. Unfortunately, there were some who subsequently retreated from this decision and on the side started to express still another opinion. At the present time, with openness (glasnost) and criticism receiving approval, the participants in the meeting emphasized the need for a more responsible approach in utilizing these opportunities in order to ensure that democratization does not become demagoguery and openness does not deteriorate into meaningless discussions. Only astonishment can result from a desire to divide the intelligentsia into two categories: one — technical, which disrupts and breaks up everything and the other — humanitarian, which

protects the culture of the people. It is precisely a result of joint efforts that we will have sufficient ability for building the long-awaited road within the period planned, for protecting our cultural heritage in the process and for laying the foundation for the practical mastering of the rich resources of the mountainous region. A competition in words as to who best loves his region or people is not needed. This must be borne out by actions.

In 1984, a council was organized in the Academy of Sciences for coordinating those scientific systems associated with the problems of planning, building and operating the Caucasus Crossing Railroad. It is presently coordinating 34 systems being carried out by 23 organizations. In addition to academic institutes, the GPI [Georgian Polytechnic Institute imeni V.I. Lenin], branch institutes of our republic and non-republic scientific-research institutes, particularly Minenergo [Ministry of Power and Electrification] and the USSR Ministry of Railways are participating in this work. A recommendation was expressed during the meeting concerning the advisability of creating, for the period of time the trunk line was under construction, a scientific-research institute for the Caucasus Mountain Railroad, in which many urgent problems which would arise during the building of the road could be completely solved on a common basis.

The Caucasus Mountain Railroad is a unique and broad scale construction project developed for the next century which will determine to a large degree the fate of socio-economic progress in the republic. Thus, importance is attached to ensuring that all aspects of the work of installing the trunk line are evaluated first of all.

Through an Economic Prism

The Institute for the Economics, Planning and Administration of the National Economy of Gosplan for the GSSR was tasked with determining the economic validity of this construction and the degree to which its effectiveness meets the requirements imposed. Towards this end, they resorted here to use of the graphic method for comparing the installation under construction against the one it was expected to replace. The latter was represented by the railroad trunk line running in the Baku direction, along which freight is transported throughout the republic. The freight is in transit over long periods of time and the shipping costs are considerable. There is still another road — the Black Sea Railroad, but an increase in its freight handling capability is impossible: a second tract with its own tunnels would have to be built here. It would be a coastal strip, be very narrow and be installed in a unique resort zone. Thus the Black Sea Railroad is not viewed as a substitute for the Caucasus Crossing Railroad and is not suitable for comparison.

The route in the Baku direction, from the north Caucasus to Tbilisi, is 1,197 kilometers in length whereas the Caucasus Mountain Railroad is only 188. The difference is more than 1,000 kilometers. This means that following the introduction into operations of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad, assuming the same freight volume, the freight turnover will decline from 50.1 billion ton-kilometers to 17.4 billion, that is, almost by threefold. Certainly, the construction of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad will be considerably more expensive than, for example, the cost for improving the Tbilisi - Baladzghari - Derbent road. This work would require an outlay of 457 million rubles, whereas the cost for building the Caucasus Mountain Railroad, as is known, is 1,185,700,000 rubles, or a difference of 728 million. In short, the capital investments required for improving the existing road would appear to be more economical. But if we are discussing the cost for freight shipments and the overall results, then a preference is undoubtedly shown for the Caucasus Mountain Railroad. It will require considerably less operational expenditures: slightly more than 20 million rubles annually compared to 98 million rubles required for shipments carried out over the roundabout road. Hence the difference in the cost of construction — 728 million rubles — is repaid by means of a savings in operational expenses realized over a period of 9 years, while at the same time the period for the repayment for the railroad is up to 12 years.

The construction of the crossing railroad is economically effective from the standpoint of retaining the population. Figures were cited during the meeting describing the present situation at Pshav-Khevsureti. In 1926, the Khevsureti population was 3,568 and in 1986 — 1,187. In the case of Pshav, the picture was as follows: the population declined from 2,237 to 1,070 during the same period. And the migration processes are continuing. For the future, the regions were expected to decline in population. It was pointed out in this regard that the railroad will bring about positive changes. It will create jobs both during the construction period and during subsequent operations. Modern and well organized settlements will appear along the route. Thus concern will have to be displaced first of all for ensuring that maximum use is made of the local population during the construction and later the operation of the road. In this manner, it will be possible to solve many problems concerned with the socio-economic development of this region.

The construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad will also exert an influence with regard to ensuring progress for the republic, especially in the sphere of science and engineering. For example, the speakers commented on the fact that were it not for the Chiatura manganese deposit Georgia would not have a mining science and its metallurgy would not be at the high level which prevails today. The Caucasus crossing will promote scientific development in several directions. The construction of this trunk line will produce such positive results that they will more than cover the negative factors and even aid in

overcoming them. The modern level for equipment and the engineering science is making it possible to reduce to a minimum the harm which the road can inflict on the surrounding environment. Thus, in the opinion of the specialists, it will be possible during the construction period not only to restore the soil cover but even to improve it from the standpoint of quality.

The Caucasus Mountain Railroad will make a contribution towards the training of highly skilled specialists capable of solving those complicated engineering problems associated with the construction and operation of the road. It will bring about an expansion in contacts between the republic's specialists and their colleagues in foreign countries possessing experience in this particular field. In particular, Switzerland was cited as an example. Here the problem of environmental protection has been solved favorably by means of electrified railroad lines. And indeed this country resembles our own republic in terms of relief.

For more than one decade this railroad will remain one of the most efficient means of transportation. Hundreds of specialists are being trained throughout the republic for the building of the steel mainlines. Many of them are already expressing a desire today to work on the Caucasus Mountain Railroad and to participate in its construction and servicing.

The preservation and further development of the cultural level of the people has always been and will continue to be conditioned by the economic potential. The artificial opposing of these two concepts is completely unjustified. Such judgements were heard in many speeches in conformity with the modern development of events associated with the restructuring. It revealed especially clearly the economic interrelationships of the Soviet republics, against the background of which a rejection of the road promises nothing good for the future. Industrial development is precisely the foundation upon which our people can develop their culture. Certainly, the development of production involves ecological, ethnographic and social difficulties and these must be overcome. And these tasks will be solved.

Responding To the Spiritual Interests of the People

The decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia and the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR on measures for the further development of archaeological studies throughout the republic and on improving the logistical base for the archaeological institutes and expeditions was published only recently. In the history of Georgian Soviet archaeology, such an extensive and important decree has never before been published. And society considers the study and preservation of historical memorials to be an urgent undertaking, having unanimously supported the recommendation for the creation of an archaeological fund for Georgia which emerged from the party's Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers.

The Georgian archaeologists have accumulated rich experience in collaborating with builders. It was as a result of such collaboration that unique archaeological findings were uncovered on one occasion during the construction of the Khramskaya Hydroelectric Power Station. A more important trend in the Soviet archaeological science has now taken root in Georgia — the archaeology of new construction projects. At the present time, 85 percent of the excavations are taking place on their territories.

The idea of building the Caucasus Mountain Railroad has a 100 year history. And the history of archaeological excavations in the Mtskheta region is 120 years old. Over the past 3 years, considerable additional work has been carried out in the zone from Caguramo to Barisakho. Moreover, these excavations are being financed by the builders themselves. Just as at other new construction projects, their material assistance is making it possible to launch extensive studies. Three expeditions of the republic's Center for Archaeological Studies are operating in the region of the route. Zones have been assigned. However, the archaeologists are obviously unable to state in advance exactly what the excavations along the route will provide. Their agreement with the builders takes all possibilities into account. Upon uncovering memorials of special importance, the archaeologists, in accordance with existing law, are authorized to hand down extreme decisions relative to their fate. And here it is very important for both sides to observe in a scrupulous manner all of the conditions of the agreement. Unfortunately, the builders are not as yet coordinating the carrying out of all types of work with the archaeologists.

Ethnographers are also working along the route — based upon an agreement concluded with the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography named I. Dzhevakhishvili and also with the State Museum of Georgia. More than 100 important memorials have already been registered. Here we have in mind not only the immediate areas in which the steel track has been laid out but also nearby territories. With regard to the railroad bed itself, at no point does it pose a direct threat to the existence of any memorial.

Only one architectural memorial is found within the borders of Georgia along this route — Kopala, not far from Chagali. It is off to the side of the route and under no danger. A second memorial of Georgian architecture — Tkobvaerda — is located on the territory of the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic. It is located 400-500 meters from the future railroad bed — also out of danger. A decision was made this year to carry out its restoration. In response to a request from the government of the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic, the Georgian specialists will undertake to restore other memorials on its territory, located in the vicinity of a highway built here.

Importance is being attached to ensuring that the building of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad makes allowance for the restoration of historical and cultural memorials uncovered in the mountains, on the territory of Georgia and in other fraternal republics, such that they may be visited by scientists and tourists. In addition, one important circumstance must not be overlooked — the large resources allocated by the state for construction of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad are providing fine opportunities for archaeological studies and the carrying out of measures aimed at protecting cultural and natural memorials. But all of this requires close and interested collaboration on the part of the scientists, specialists, planners and certainly the builders.

During the meeting, the latter were reproached regarding a recent vexing incident. The region in which the earth work was started had been inspected by the archaeologists in June of last year. They had indicated the particular sectors in which the builders could operate in the absence of special authorization. In one such sector, a bulldozer uncovered a buried memorial, the existence of which was not hitherto known.

The speakers cautioned that this incident must serve as a lesson. The personnel responsible for the construction and archaeological work must exercise joint and constant control over the various areas. This is a very important question. Everyone, commencing with the rank and file excavator and bulldozer operators must recognize their responsibility in this regard. Together they must all display concern, strive to avoid misunderstandings, observe the norms on a strict basis and resolve all problems in a timely and competent manner.

The participants in the meeting repeatedly returned to the problem of coordinated and mutually responsible actions on the part of the archaeologists, ecologists and builders. The need for this arose 10 years ago when the Center for Archaeological Studies was tasked with studying a route for the future road. Each archaeologist considered it his duty to participate in this study. At the time, a conflict arose between the authors of the plan, Gosstroy and the archaeologists in connection with the fact that it was impossible to forecast in advance the volume of archaeological excavations and hence the period of time required to carry them out. One categorical requirement of the archaeologists is the fact that the road must not pass through Nastakisi. And thereafter, having acquainted itself with the status of affairs in the various areas, the republic's leadership tasked the builders with detouring the road around a valley in which archaeological studies were to be carried out.

Similar situations may arise in the future. Thus a station is being built in the environs of Tsilkani which may require a study of an area of 40 hectares. Such an area cannot be studied within the framework of a period defined in advance. The site of an ancient town dating

back to the 12th and 13th centuries was uncovered during the course of archaeological work carried out in the village of Chinta. It also requires extended study.

A discussion of the Caucasus Mountain Railroad is a continuation of one which the archaeologists have been conducting for many years. Many construction projects, including large-scale ones, are constantly being planned. The planners at times demand conclusions from the archaeologists, failing to realize that a territory must be studied thoroughly before construction can commence. It was noted during the meeting that departmental interests cannot be allowed to stand as an obstacle in the path of scientific forecasting and study.

During the meeting, the builders were at times reminded of an example of short-sightedness — the building of a rope-way station alongside the unique Sameba memorial. Is there anyone who opposes granting easy access for people to this memorable sight? But the nearness of the station only makes it look ugly, disrupts the architectural and natural harmony and inhibits the perception of striking beauty. The republic's Council of Ministers has now handed down a decision calling for the station to be removed. Similar mistakes must be avoided during the building of the railroad. All measures must be undertaken to ensure that no harm is inflicted upon anybody or anything and this goal is within the capability of our modern science, engineering and construction.

This must be reflected in the:

People Inhabiting the Mountains

In their speeches, the scientists and specialists of various disciplines cited alarming data on the migration processes of the population living in the regions where the future trunk line is to be built. Many are alarmed by the demographic problems. In particular, in Dushetskiy Rayon, where the situation has stabilized somewhat in recent years, migration is nevertheless continuing. The forecast for the year 2000 reveals that this factor alone will cause the region's population to decline by 10 percent. In addition to other factors, this is explained by limited employment. At the present time, roughly 2,600 individuals are not working on public farms. Compared to the average republic indicator, the rayon's volume of gross agricultural output per capita is less by a factor of 1.8. Accordingly, the average republic wage level is considerably lower.

An analysis of the reasons for the population migration in a large number of alpine rayons reveals that the chief factor is the absence of roads. In such rayons as Akh-metskiy, Kazbegskiy, Dushetskiy, Tianetskiy and others, the number of roads per square kilometer of territory is less by a factor of 11 than the average for a rural area in the republic. Based upon this fact, it is not difficult to draw the conclusion that one of the most important measures for retaining the population in the various areas is that of a correct system of roads, including a

combination of motor vehicle transport with railroad transport. With the building of the trunk line, Dushetskiy and Kazbegskiy rayons, in addition to the traditional branch of agriculture — animal husbandry — will be able to undertake a course aimed at industrial development. This will bring about an expansion in the sphere of cultural- domestic services. Real opportunities will appear for the intensive development of tourism.

Many residents of mountainous regions have already expressed a desire to carry out work concerned with the construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad. But it is still not possible to satisfy all of their requests: there are no financial plans and this is preventing an increase in workers. Of the 2,000 individuals already working today on the construction project and a like number who will arrive from the Zhinvali GES, 80 derive from the indigenous nationality while the remainder are representatives of other nationalities residing in Georgia. Roughly one half are residents of Dushetskiy Rayon. It is interesting to note that among them there are more than 200 families which migrated earlier but which now have returned to their native krays in connection with the construction of the Zhinvali GES. Apartment dwellings and cultural-domestic installations will be built in all of the populated points along the route, roads and water lines will be installed and stores, medical points and movie theaters will be placed in operation.

Work has already commenced in this regard in Dushetskiy Rayon. In particular, construction work is rapidly being completed in the rayon center on a coastal reinforcement wall which will protect Dusheti against possible onslaughts by the elements. It will also permit the use of the embankment for the movement of transport vehicles, thus by-passing the city. The participants in the meeting were presented with the following problem for examination: the transport route through Krestovyy Pass plays a large role and yet for the past 5-7 months is has been closed owing to an abundance of snow and the danger of avalanches. Ideally the building of a gallery type tunnel up to 2 kilometers in length will make it possible to maintain constant contact with Kazbegskiy Rayon.

The railroad will facilitate the driving of sheep to the Kizlyar pastures, which today are occupied more than 4 months each year and, most importantly, it will improve the socio-economic and domestic conditions for the sheep breeders. Today Dushetskiy Rayon is confronted by a special danger: landslides, avalanches and flooding. According to a conclusion reached by geologists, 220 families must be resettled outside this dangerous zone. Certainly, all wish to resettle down below and migration is inevitable. Reinforcement work associated with construction of the trunk line must be employed in the interest of retaining the residents in the various areas. At the present time, a lack of roads has already produced situations in which only 15 individuals remain at local kolkhozes. The trunk line will enliven the region and

make it stronger from a cultural and economic standpoint. It will improve noticeably the work of the entire agro-industrial complex: indeed, the agroprom [agro-industrial committee] is importing more goods than it is exporting. In addition to supporting the construction idea, this department must participate in every possible way in solving the economic, ecological and demographic problems associated with it.

Many of the speakers touched upon those ecological and demographic problems which have been seriously neglected in recent years as a result of failure to attach proper value to them. In particular, the opinion was expressed that perhaps, based upon the experience of Leningrad residents, the residents of Tbilisi and other city-dwellers should be allowed to acquire abandoned homes in mountainous regions and cultivate tracts around them. The following idea was proposed: to create a special committee which would concern itself with the settlement of Aragvi Gorge, as took place during the initial years in the development of Kolkhida.

People who grow up on the land and then lose contact with it are like trees without roots. Yes and it was emphasized during the meeting that there is a vital need for the city-dwellers to return.

Face To Face With Nature

Three years ago, specialists attached to the State Committee for the Protection of Nature of the Georgian SSR acquainted themselves in detail with the plan for the future trunk line, they held discussions with the railroad workers and planners and they raised no objections with regard to its principal positions. Two months ago, they assembled together once again and confirmed the general opinion: the construction of the railroad is economically justified and beyond any doubt it will promote further development of the alpine regions. Nevertheless, the questions concerned with protecting nature were raised once again during the meeting and their interpretation revealed a definite prejudice. The departmental tasks were viewed only from the standpoint of exercising control over how these complicated problems are being solved by others. However the protection of nature requires the development of preventive measures mainly by those who bear direct responsibility by virtue of their state obligations and professional knowledge.

According to data for the Caucasus Mountain Railroad project, 120 kilometers of the trunk line pass over Georgian territory and encompass 250 hectares of forest and 4 hectares of undergrowth. During construction of the road, approximately 100-110 hectares of timber will be rooted out. But according to a preliminary inspection, this is low quality timber. This variant was selected from several proposed by the planning organizations in the belief that it is most responsive to the recommendations and advice furnished by the republic's Ministry of the Forestry Industry. A working group was created in the ministry for the purpose of exercising control over the

optimum use of the area set aside for the route. It is systematically supervising each specific incident and undertaking the measures required with regard to violators. For example, in April 1986, in a zone for the expansion of a road, 13 cubic meters of timber were cut down illegally and as a result the chief of the Magaroskarskiy Forestry Organization was removed from his post. Restorative work is presently being carried out in this sector.

It cannot be stated that railroad transport is absolutely clean from an ecological standpoint. But a comparison of figures conducted during the meeting serves to convince one regarding its advantages. Today one and a half million tons of harmful substances are being discharged annually into the republic's air basin, with 1 million tons of this amount being caused by motor transport operations. The trunk line will reduce motor transport shipments considerably and this will make it possible to decrease by 250,000 tons the amount of exhaust gases in the atmosphere. This is of tremendous importance in view of the fact that the route's zone will become a resort zone in the future. In this regard, a recommendation was made to solve the fuel problem in this zone through the use of electric power, rather than be installing a gas line.

The participants in the meeting directed the attention of the planners and builders to the tasks associated with preserving the local species of Caucasus flora and the need for preparing ecological charts for the zone was pointed out. In short, the construction of the trunk line imposes requirements upon everyone.

Functioning Together

Today there are few who question the need for building the Caucasus Crossing Railroad. It is important that no mistakes be made either in the practical implementation or in providing ideological support for this vitally important construction project and any attempt to artificially exaggerate the problems should be resisted. By no means can we remain indifferent to the position taken by certain well known figures to whom people listen and who create public opinion. And by no means can we remain indifferent to the information being made available to our young audience.

In this regard, it was stated during the meeting that the primary obligation of the komsomol organizations is to carry out active work with the youth and particularly that segment which still does not fully understand the importance being attached to the construction of this road. The construction project has been declared to be a shock komsomol project and thus it is important for the youth to strive to participate not only in the construction but also in the archaeological studies. In particular, this summer 80 students will complete a work semester carrying out work in excavations and the young workers of some enterprises will join in this work during their vacation periods.

In terms of its engineering plan and solution, the Caucasus crossing is itself a memorial of material culture and one which future generations will be proud of. It is similar to the Inguri GES, the construction of which at one time, as a result of correct orientation and information, became a national endeavor. The construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad, which will bring the republic many blessings, must also become an object of general concern. In particular, it will enable youth to return to their native krais, to find work that they like and to satisfy their cultural, social and material needs.

Those who participated in the meeting stated that the interest in and detailed discussion of the construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad are quite natural under the conditions imposed by extensive openness. However, those who express their opinions on this important question must bear responsibility for their judgements and recommendations and not deviate from the truth. Discussions and debates can produce positive results only when they are honest and dictated by an unbiased attitude towards the problem and its true sense. Immaterial details must not overshadow the interests of the work. The importance of this truly state endeavor must be properly evaluated and society must be oriented correctly in this regard.

Each individual who makes a decision as to whether or not this road will come into being must devote thought to how it will develop and how it will effect the Georgian economy in the future. At one time, many spoke out against the development of power engineering. It was mentioned during the meeting that they dragged out in every possible way the planning and construction of the power installations. The consequences of this are being felt today — the power supply is not satisfying the republic's requirements. The same result may ensue in the case of railroad transport if we decline to build the Caucasus Mountain Railroad. Another consideration is the fact that during its construction it will be necessary to display a high degree of exactingness with regard to measures for protecting historical and cultural memorials and the environment and achieving a correct solution for all socio-demographic problems. The participants in the meeting stated that a discussion of these questions will force everyone to draw the proper conclusions.

The road, which quite properly is considered to be a construction project of the century, must in the future be the center of attention for every communist, each leader and each citizen of the republic. Those who know the economy and its dynamics in the republic and country and who are aware of the demographic changes taking place today understand that if this road is not built there will be no future prospects for the mastering and development of the mountain regions. This is a remarkable corner of our republic, but we must not forget that deserted mountains constitute a more terrible spectacle than a desert. Moreover, this question is important not only from a republic but also from an all-union standpoint. For the most typical operational feature of our

party is a harmonious combination of state and national interests. And thus each individual who is involved in this grandiose construction project, particularly the leaders of all interested organizations, must be imbued with a sense not only of their own official responsibility but also their party and civil obligations and they must hold these concerns close to their hearts. All measures must be undertaken to ensure that the economic and socio-cultural return from this road is experienced by our generation — its builders.

Who today can imagine the Borzhomi Gorge without a railroad? It was built on the eve of this present century and it serves us loyally today. The building of a unique railroad trunk line at the end of the 20th century, one which will have no equal in Europe, will be a victory for our leading engineering and scientific thought, for our contemporaries and for our time.

The participants in the meeting unanimously approved the conclusions drawn by the committee of the Council

of Ministers for the Georgian SSR concerning the urgent need for further socio-economic development in the republic and construction of the Caucasus Crossing Railroad.

Taking into account the importance attached to building the Caucasus Mountain Railroad, the interest being shown in achieving correct and complete solutions for all of the associated problems and the desires and comments expressed in mass media publications, a decision has been handed down calling for the formation of an advisory council. This council will consist of competent and authoritative specialists of various profiles and scientific and cultural figures and it will be chaired by the president of the Academy of Sciences for the Georgian SSR A.N. Tavkhelidze. Its mission will be to monitor the planning and construction of the trunk line in a comprehensive and high quality manner.

7026

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

17 Nov. 1987